



URBAN AND RURAL REPORTS 2017:1

On Illegal Killings of Wildlife in Fennoscandia

Symposium Report

ERICA VON ESSEN

HELENA NORDSTRÖM KÄLLSTRÖM • HANS PETER HANSEN

M NILS PETERSON • TARLA R. PETERSON

Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences
Department of Urban and Rural Development

URBAN AND RURAL REPORTS 2017:1

On Illegal Killings of Wildlife in Fennoscandia

Symposium Report

ERICA VON ESSEN
HELENA NORDSTRÖM KÄLLSTRÖM • HANS PETER HANSEN
M NILS PETERSON • TARLA R. PETERSON

Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences
Department of Urban and Rural Development

URBAN AND RURAL REPORTS 2017:1

Within the series are published reports from the divisions at the department: Agrarian History, Environmental Communication, Landscape Architecture, Rural Development and the Swedish Centre for Nature Interpretation.

The aim of the report series Urban and Rural reports, issued by the Department of Urban and Rural Development, SLU Ultuna, is to present research, teaching and other interesting activities in progress at the department in a popular science way.

Members of the Board of editors: Andrew Butler, PhD, Landscape architecture
Emil Sandström, PhD, Rural development
Lotten Westberg, PhD, Environmental communication
and Nature interpretation
Carin Martiin, PhD, Agricultural history

Legally responsible publisher: Lars Johansson
eISBN: 978-91-85735-43-3
© 2017 Authors and Board of editors

Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences ▪ Department of Urban and Rural Development

Postal address: P.O. Box 7012, SE-750 07 Uppsala SWEDEN
Visiting address: Ulls väg 27
Delivery address: Ulls gränd 1
Phone: +46 18 67 10 00
E-mail: sol@slu.se
Web address: www.slu.se/sol

Preface

The organizers of the symposium want to thank every participant for their active engagement in and contribution to the symposium. The organizers also want to thank the invited speakers outside the research project for their talks: Dr. Olve Krange, Dr. Mari Pohja-Mykrä and Professor Paul Larsson.

The participants in attendance do not represent an exhaustive list of practitioners involved in illegal hunting research or enforcement in the Nordic countries. However, there was a consensus at the symposium that each of these participants possessed a valuable formal and informal network of further contacts to whom this report should be circulated.

The report comes at a time when tensions in the implementation of the EU Nature Directives generally and in the wolf conservation context particularly remain high for local communities, local agencies and state authorities alike. It is our aim with the report to orient the reader in the most current talking points in the illegal hunting context and, with these, consider ways forward.

Summary

For the past four years, a FORMAS-funded project at the Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences has examined the phenomenon of illegal hunting in Sweden. This project is *Confronting challenges to political legitimacy of the natural resource management regulatory regime in Sweden—the case of illegal hunting in Sweden*. The principal aim of the research project has been to determine the constitutive features of the crime as it looks in contemporary Sweden; to map attitudes among hunters toward illegal hunting; identify drivers to illegally hunt and to explain illegal hunting in terms of a legitimacy crisis.

A point of departure for this qualitative investigation has been the reported low levels of trust in and compliance with Nature Directives and their practical application and enforcement in the countryside. The legitimacy of wildlife and hunting regulation is now contested. Illegal hunting becomes a manifestation of this legitimacy problem, but also a continued challenge for management.

The situation is similar not only across the Nordic countries, but also in other EU member states who are signatories of the same conservation directives. At times, even countries that are not EU members both affect and become affected by EU-level decisions concerning conservation of large carnivores, like Norway which shares its wolf population with Sweden. Illegal hunting represents one manifestation of the disenfranchisement that rural communities—and particularly hunters in Scandinavia—experience in the face of wolf conservation and the way it is handled. Hence, the socio-politically mediated crime of illegal hunting under investigation is largely inseparable from the wolf context in the Nordic countries. It consequently constituted a focal point of the research project.

The following report represents the synthesis of discussions that came out of a final symposium organized by the research project members to disseminate their research results with practitioners for the first time. Featuring 45 specially invited participants engaged in discussions on illegal hunting over the course of two days, the symposium presented unique opportunity also for the pan-Nordic context of practitioners to come together to reflect on research findings, share insights, and pose questions. Some researchers engaged in illegal hunting research in Norway, Finland and Denmark were also in attendance. However, the primary aim of the symposium was to invite the discussion of practitioners rather than scholars. Invitations were hence sent out to representatives of Environmental Non-Governmental Organisations (ENGOS), Hunting Associations across the Nordic countries, County Administrative Boards (CAB),

Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) personnel, livestock and farming organisations (such as The Federation of Swedish Farmers, 'LRF'), law enforcement and environmental attorneys. FACE: The European Federation of Associations for Hunting & Conservation, were also represented.

Seven expert talks were presented consecutively on the first day, and four on the second day. The remainder of the time was spent in group discussions and subsequent plenary presentations of key points. These groups were homogenous on the first day, consolidating ENGO representatives, County Administrative Board personnel, researchers and hunting association representatives respectively. During the second day's more extensive group work, groups were constituted in a cross-disciplinary, cross-national, cross-agency capacity. These groups presented their main messages in plenary followed by discussions.

Four principal themes emerged from the combined discussions of the symposium: (1) the role of the EU, in which the Commission on the Environment frequently appeared as the 'elephant in the room'; (2) the importance of addressing social control in rural communities to mitigate illegal hunting; (3) the juridification of wolf and wildlife management to the point of courtroom management of e.g. license hunts and (4) the role of democratic dialogue and new platforms for popular participation on wolf conservation in preventing illegal hunting.

Themes (1) and (3) pertained to how legal or supranational frameworks imposed constraints on or facilitated current regulation and management. They were parameters that a majority of participants experienced as exasperating. They meant putting democracy out of play, and detaching public concerns from the people affected and migrating instead into bureaucratic domains. Themes (2) and (4) concerned more optimistic and bottom-up approaches to mitigating illegal hunting. It was recognized that hunters were the most effective deterrents to illegal hunting, not legal directives or education disseminated from agencies. Consequently the climate of opinion around illegal hunting provided by the hunting community had to be addressed to remove a base of (perceived or actual) support or sympathy for illegal hunting of e.g. wolves and large carnivores.

The final theme, (4), pertained to openings for improved relations that could on the one hand instill a sense of ownership and responsibility in hunters over their local landscape. On the other hand, it pertained to openings which were in the service of the state if it sought long-term legitimacy of its policy. It was recognized that the kind of opposition that culminated in illegal hunting was rooted less in hatred toward the wolf or in fundamental rejections of conservation directives, and more in the way in which wolves were (mis-)managed, the premises around decision-making and distorted procedures within the 'system'. Calling for a comprehensive rehaul of the latter rather than the wolf itself, the conclusion remains optimistic: these can be changed. The report offers some concrete approaches for revising these.

Keywords: Illegal hunting, poaching, legitimacy, Habitats Directive, social control, wolf conservation, dissent, Natura 2000.

Authors

ERICA VON ESSEN, Postdoctoral Researcher at the Division of Environmental Communication, Department of Urban and Rural Development, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences. von Essen's research areas include illegal hunting, wildlife ethics and political theory.

HELENA NORDSTRÖM KÄLLSTRÖM, Researcher at the Division of Environmental Communication, Department of Urban and Rural Development, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences. She has been working with livestock farmers, their ethics, and social sustainability of rural livelihoods and lifestyles.

HANS PETER HANSEN, Researcher at Department of Bioscience - Wildlife Ecology at Aarhus University, previously Researcher at the Division of Environmental Communication, Department of Urban and Rural Development, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences. Hansen works with the challenges of modernity and the responses of society; within this, he has looked at sustainable and democratic approaches to natural resource management.

M NILS PETERSON, Associate Professor, Department of Forestry and Environmental Resources, College of Natural Resources, North Carolina State University. His areas of expertise include intersections between human and natural systems and, in particular, issues pertaining to wildlife management and hunting.

TARLA R. PETERSON, Professor of communication, Department of Communication, University of Texas at El Paso and former Guest Professor at the Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences. Professor Peterson specializes in qualitative social research, environmental communication and natural resource management.

Content

Background	11
Aim of symposium	12
Participants, hosts and “no-shows”	13
Case Setting	14
A note on anonymity	15
Day 1: Summary of Proceedings	17
Welcome and Introduction	17
Illegal Hunting as Neo-Liberal Colonialism	17
The De-humanization and the Weaponisation of Anti-Poaching Measures	18
Illegal Hunting as a Challenge to Natural Resource Management: Contested Legitimacy and Resistance	19
Illegal Killing in Finland	21
Policing Perspective on Illegal Hunting	22
Illegal Hunting as a Crime of Dissent	23
Day 2: Summary of Proceedings	27
Whose Resources?	27
Hunting, Wildlife and Ethics	27
The Preliminary Survey Results	28
Ways Toward Legitimate Wildlife Management	30
Group-based Discussions	31

Synthesizing discussion	39
“The Elephant in the Room”—the European Union.	39
Norway’s non-membership	39
Social Control among Hunters	42
Juridification of Wolf Management and its Implications	44
Future perspectives on the mitigation of illegal hunting	46
Concluding comment	49
References	51
Appendix I	55

Background

Few societal issues demand interdisciplinary and multi-agency collaboration as much as illegal killing: the unlawful taking of wildlife (Musgrave *et al.*, 1993; Eliason, 1999; Blevins and Edwards, 2009). Outside of the more familiar African context of rhino horn and ivory trade, there is a breed of illegal hunting also in Europe. This is that of citizens' non-compliance with EU conservation directives and, indeed, their sometimes direct defiance of protective legislation around large carnivore species like the wolf (von Essen and Allen, 2015). This phenomenon is as much a recent reaction against EU's increased control of the countryside and its natural resources as it represents a symptom of a lack of legitimacy of governing authorities, a historical driver to poaching globally (Thompson, 1975; Manning, 1993; Archer, 1999).

While illegal hunting shows diversity across individual offenders' rationales, one unifying theme in the Nordic countries (Sweden, Norway, Finland and Denmark) behind illegal hunting appears to be a sense of powerlessness or disenfranchisement on the part of hunters toward conservation directives (Hagstedt and Korsell, 2012). This mistrust in politicians and the turn toward taking the law into one's own hands on the countryside is a worrisome development in the Nordic countries. This is so, not least for the sake of the protected wildlife populations whose lives are bereaved by illegal killers, and whose population viability may be undermined. But also for the legitimacy of public authorities in general. The phenomenon is one with wider political implications and international repercussions; if a social group, like livestock farmers, hunters or rural residents, feels betrayed by the government on one point, it may breed distrust and political populism among them generally. And if a species is illegally killed in one region, it may undermine conservation efforts elsewhere, as in, for example, the case of illegal killing of birds in Malta, which is estimated to implicate a minimum of 36 countries (Raine *et al.*, 2016)

On the basis of this problem, the FORMAS funded research project *Confronting challenges to political legitimacy of the natural resource management regulatory regime in Sweden—the case of illegal hunting in Sweden* set out to investigate and map the sociopolitical drivers to illegal hunting in Sweden, with close links to researchers in Norway and Finland, but also beyond Scandinavia. Following three and a half years of qualitative interdisciplinary studies of the attitudes, discourses and hunting practices that

comprised Swedish hunters'¹ relationship with public authorities, the project arrived at a close at the end of 2016. This motivated a final symposium with Nordic practitioners for the dissemination and discussion of its research and ways forward to mitigate the illegal hunting phenomenon.

The symposium was held over two days 30 November–1 December at Bergendals Herrgård in Sollentuna, outside of Stockholm. It comprised 45 participants, including all five members of the FORMAS research project plus two project assistants who helped organize, host and record the event.

Aim of symposium

The aim of the final symposium was threefold. First, it aimed to present to the public and to practitioners the results of a combined qualitative (interviews), quantitative (survey) and desk-based (literature reviews) study of illegal hunting in Sweden and elsewhere (through collaborations and literature reviews).

Second, where the research project has continuously collaborated across academic contexts, including hosting a formal researchers' symposium in 2014 (synthesized in a workshop report by von Essen *et al.*, 2015), this symposium marked the first gathering of practitioners: including County Administrative Board personnel, hunting association representatives, environmental non-governmental organisations and law enforcement.

Thirdly, the symposium aimed to establish a cross-agency Nordic forum for a critical discussion about ways forward to understand, mitigate and address illegal hunting.

Concrete objectives of the two-day symposium included continued dialogue between and across interest parties and, in the more long term, proposals to the government for alternative ways forward in engaging hunters and legislating policy. They also included the production of a synthesis of symposium proceedings and discussions in English and in Swedish. The following report represents this effort.

The report is structured in the following way: first, invited participants and attendees are presented. The full list of final participants is available in Appendix I of this report. The second section of the report presents the proceedings in the form of summaries of speakers' presentations followed immediately by plenary discussion and responses to these talks. In the third part of the report, the discussion work of nine transdisciplinary groups is presented. In the fourth and final part of the report, a final written discussion synthesizes the themes of the symposium.

¹ Against the background that Swedish hunters are among the most vocal critics of large carnivore conservation policy, as well as the demographic that commits illegal hunting of these species.

Participants, hosts and “no-shows”

Project members Hans Peter Hansen, Erica von Essen and Helena Nordström Källström from the Environmental Communication Division at the Swedish University for Agricultural Sciences planned and hosted the symposium together with project assistant Sofia Efraimsson (also SLU). Remaining project members M Nils Peterson and Tarla R. Peterson from North Carolina State University and El Paso University of Texas respectively also participated in the symposium, in English. Assistants Per Haglind (SLU) and Sofia Efraimsson recorded notes of proceedings.

There were broadly four categories of persons who received an invitation for the symposium via email in October 2016.

Hunters

The first category comprised hunting, livestock and forestry association representatives. Multiple invitations to all the Nordic hunting organisations were sent. The magazines associated with the hunting associations were also invited. FACE, the Federation of Associations for Hunting and Conservation was also invited. Livestock and forestry associations invitations were limited to Sweden to keep down the number of participants.

Civil servants

The second category comprised public authorities and local agencies working with the implementation of wildlife conservation or the enforcement of hunting regulation. This group also included civil servants from County Administrative Boards (henceforth CABs) in Sweden’s wolf dense counties, Dalarna, Örebro, Jämtland and Värmland, with additional participants from Norrbotten county. Invitations were also sent to Nordic wildlife agencies, including the Swedish Environmental Protection Agency (SEPA) and Styrelsen for Vand- og Naturforvaltning (Denmark), Miljødirektoratet (Norway) and The Finnish Wildlife Agency, but also to political departments, district environmental attorney and the police authority.

ENGOS

The third category was a selection of civil society associations for nature protection, animal rights and wolf conservation. The selection here was limited to Sweden. Two guests were invited from each ENGO, including the World Wildlife Fund (WWF), Swedish Society for Nature Protection and the Swedish Predator Association. In these cases, with the exception of known illegal hunting contacts, organizations were invited to select their relevant representatives to send to the symposium.

Researchers

The fourth and final category of participants was Nordic researchers involved in illegal hunting research. They had been identified on the basis of previous contacts and collaboration with the FORMAS research project. The total number of researchers was deliberately kept low for this symposium, as it principally aimed at exploring implications for practice rather than for future research.

Declined invitations

The topic of illegal hunting may have discouraged some participants, despite costs of stay and conference being fully paid for by the research project. Indeed, there was a relatively low turnout of environmental and animal rights non-governmental organizations. For various reasons, the only attendee from this category was a regional representative of the Swedish Society for Nature Protection, who participated only in the first day of proceedings. No forestry associations responded or participated. Other organisations either expressed skepticism toward the symposium, citing fears that it could be a PR event for a forgiving attitude toward illegal hunting², had their invitations lost internally, or cancelled at the last minute because of sickness.

Case Setting

Although the aim of the symposium was to discuss the sociopolitical drivers of illegal hunting in general, a substantial amount of time was spent on discussing illegal hunting of wolves in particular. This focus reflects the situation in Scandinavia where illegal hunting in relation to wolf management is especially high on the political agenda.

As such, the Scandinavian wolf situation constitutes the perhaps predominant contemporary illegal hunting case in which the sociopolitical drivers are manifest. It would not with this audience make sense to demarcate the existing wolf situation from the discussion. Having stated that, it is however important to remind readers that there are also other contexts in which sociopolitical drivers more or less directly play a role in illegal hunting as well as in other types of resistance or expressions of discontent. Some of those were mentioned at the symposium and included illegal hunting related to moose and deer management, and are discussed on pp 25, 34, 42.

² <http://svenskjakt.se/opinion/debatt/rovdjursforeningen-symposiet-kunde-bli-ett-pr-jippo/>.

A note on anonymity

Due to the sensitive nature of illegal hunting, this report anonymizes all contributions from group and plenary discussions. Speakers with presentations are referred to by name when their talks are summarized, but the authors of quotes, perspectives or arguments presented in the discussion sessions are anonymized simply as “a participant” or, where appropriate to the particular point made, is designated also by their affiliation (e.g. “an animal welfare NGO participant added that...”). The list of participants is available in Appendix I.

Day 1: Summary of Proceedings

Welcome and Introduction

Dr. Hans Peter Hansen

Day one of the symposium started with an opening introduction by Hans Peter Hansen, the project leader of *Confronting challenges to political legitimacy of the natural resource management regulatory regime in Sweden—the case of illegal hunting in Sweden*. The opening introduction clarified the aim and expectations of the event, along with the rationale behind the invited participants. Hansen presented illegal hunting as a phenomenon that had been subject to polarizing interpretations historically: condemned and criminalized as terror vs. romanticized as social banditism. He suggested that reality, likely, lay somewhere between these two extremes.

The urgency of illegal hunting was motivated both from a societal and a wildlife management perspective as Hansen observed the crime was a challenge not only to large carnivore conservation, but also to the rule of law. It concluded by providing a full disposition for the day's program, and an encouragement to participants to contribute with comments or questions throughout.

Illegal Hunting as Neo-Liberal Colonialism

Dr. M Nils Peterson

The second speaker of the day was M Nils Peterson, who presented “Illegal hunting as sociopolitical resistance in an international perspective”. The presentation offered a critical perspective on current approaches to understanding and mitigating illegal hunting across global contexts. Peterson summarized the research approaches taken so far, including rational-choice models for predicting and deterring non-compliance with wildlife regulation. Profiling perpetrators, for example, remains a leading approach

on the part of game wardens to enforce hunting laws today in the US (Eliason, 2013).

Peterson also discussed neo-liberal colonialism as a potential driver of illegal hunting, examining how new policies and laws in the name of progress (“eco-governmentality” criminalize natural resource management in traditional communities (Peterson *et al.*, 2016). In this way, a radical perspective was taken on illegal hunting that questioned e.g. the alienation of people from the products of their labor.

The De-humanization and the Weaponisation of Anti-Poaching Measures

Dr. Erica von Essen

The third speaker of the day was Erica von Essen. Her talk focused on the African context of poaching, with a particular focus on anti-poaching enforcement and paramilitary campaigns. Von Essen presented the more familiar cases of rhino horn and ivory poaching and the sorts of military responses this criminal enterprise had incurred in Botswana, South Africa, Mozambique and Zambia to name a few countries. The presentation was undergirded by literature studies on Anti-Poaching Units and empirical data from colleagues who had worked in this field and case context.

The role of military defense contractors and technology was emphasized and positioned in relation to a growing environmental-capitalist-patriotist complex in which the war on poachers has become a war on terror, funded by an international elite (Wall and McClanahan, 2015). Links were made to the Nordic context of illegal hunting through identifying, first, legitimacy problems on the part of authority, and, second, the perceived appropriation of indigenous or local wildlife by ‘outside’ forces—either bureaucrats, animal rights activists or global conservation agendas (Fairhead *et al.*, 2012; Massé and Lunstrum, 2016). Hence, protected animals were now seen as “their” pets—a phenomenon that has also been observed in the Nordic countries (Ojalammi and Blomley, 2015).

Reflections from participants on this talk affirmed the problematic situation in which a lack of choice and the low legitimacy of the enforcement authority meant park rangers in national parks (such as Limpopo) sometimes turned poachers during the night to supplement their income (Givá, 2016).

The Role of the State

Discussions on the role and strength of the state in these situations were central to this session. ‘Weak’ African states were particularly vulnerable to the wills and agendas of foreign investors, donors and military contractors where wildlife conservation was concerned. Indeed, such militarized states were fortified now only in the same of commanding greater coercive power, and not power through moral legitimacy in the eyes of its people.

In contrast to the African context, participants observed that in Nordic states, citizens have trusted, and in most areas, continue to trust the government and politicians (Holmberg and Weibull, 2011). The one exception, it was observed, was the issue of large carnivore conservation, where there was a rapid erosion of trust in public agencies and the state. This was seen as an out of character development that needed to be recognized and problematized.

Illegal Hunting as a Challenge to Natural Resource Management: Contested Legitimacy and Resistance

Dr. Olve Krange

The fourth speaker was Dr. Olve Krange from Norsk institutt for naturforskning in Oslo. Together with Dr. Paul Larsson (also in attendance) and Dr. Ketil Skogen (not in attendance), he heads up an illegal hunting research project focused on the Norwegian context. Introducing this project, titled *Illegal Hunting as a Challenge to Natural Resource Management: Contested Legitimacy and Resistance*, Krange explained it will primarily be survey-based and that parts of the survey have been worked out in collaboration with the Swedish FORMAS funded research team, to facilitate the future sharing of datasets across the countries. The basic premises of this project are to explore the socio-political drivers to illegal hunting among Norwegian hunters. Unlike the Swedish survey, the Norwegian survey will be distributed in three different versions: one to hunters, one to affected communities and one to the broader public.

Krange also presented ethnographic work from a group of working class illegal hunting sympathizers he had spent time with (“Frank and his friends”), building on research methods he has previously undertaken in the large carnivore context in Norway (Krange and Skogen, 2007; 2011). Although attitudes toward the state and toward carnivores were extremely critical, Krangle found that even among the most disenfranchised and angry hunters that he had managed to reach as a result of respondent snowballing, there was some ambivalence or respect toward the wolf as an animal. It was attributed with the label a “true hunter” which is high praise from a human hunter. This potentially pointed to these hunters experiencing disenfranchisement with policy, administration and regulation more so than with the protected animals themselves. In addition, Krangle traced their animosity to class conflict. “Frank” and his peers noted how the government did not appreciate their situation or know what it was like living with wolves and the losses this entailed.

In the plenary reflection to Krangle’s talk, Norwegian participants weighed in to reflect on the political state in Norway and its implications for illegal hunting. They observed that the wolf issue was a significant challenge to political unity, even within

the same political party. Right-wing party representatives appear to be more negative toward wolf conservation, but the labor party is less clear in its stance. The center party, however, was identified as recognizably anti-wolf. The Norwegian situation was briefly discussed in relation to the Swedish political situation, where political parties have arguably not profiled themselves to the same extent in the wolf issue as Norway. The discussion turned to the topic of legitimacy. Here, laws needed to carefully resonate with local people's cultural-moral praxis, and this was identified as a problem today. Specifically, the Norwegian participants highlighted erosion of legitimacy following contradictory policy decisions. For example, it was observed that "one year you can get indicted for shooting a wolf in a certain pack, and then the next year the government comes out and sanctions a protective cull for that same pack". The signal this sent was that less than a year apart, the same act of hunting on the same wolf pack took place in widely different legal landscapes. On the same theme, it was also observed that there were discrepancies across space as well as time: with the zoning policy for wolf management in Norway, a wolf wandering south of Trysil would become "protected".

The polarization between poaching and government-sponsored protective culling sounded a call for a middle-ground with pro-active management (through regular hunting) of wolves by hunters. One observed that there had been a potentially dangerous passification (in the sense of rendering 'passive') of the hunting community in their relation to wolves in previous years, which now needed to orient itself to an active management strategy where wolf hunting became normalized as part of a package of legitimate management actions—the year around. It was observed, however, that the Swedish situation was characterized by careful political endorsements of needing to 'manage' the wolf (rather than simply conserve it), but that this was off-set by legal appeals by environmental non-governmental organisations. This in turn constituted a blow to the legitimacy of the political apparatus. Research is not clear on the link between activating hunters in wolf management and increased acceptance for wolves (see for example Browne-Núñez *et al.*, 2015; Chapron and Treves, 2016). But more research is needed in the Nordic context of legal wolf hunting.

The final topic that was raised in conjunction with Kränge's talk was that of conspiracy theories around the wolf. The narrative of secretly released wolves enjoys considerable support locally, but also across Europe with the same rumor reproduced almost identically in Spain, Greece, Finland, Sweden, Switzerland, Denmark and Germany (Theodorakea and von Essen, 2016). The exact means of 'escape' or 'release', as well as the organisations behind it, differ somewhat nationally, but their shared characteristic is popular disbelief in the natural re-colonization by wolves in such a short time.

Illegal Killing in Finland

Dr. Mari Pohja-Mykrä

Dr. Pohja-Mykrä's talk provided the lay of the land of illegal hunting in the Finnish context. Pohja-Mykrä discussed her past research interviewing both convicted illegal hunting and non-hunters about their willingness to break the law, their sympathy toward illegal hunting, and the neutralisations of large carnivore crimes (Pohja-Mykrä and Kurki, 2014; Pohja-Mykrä, 2016a;c; Pohja-Mykrä, 2016b). Some of this was explained through socio-psychological theories of group behavior. A central concept to this talk was defiance, adapted from Sherman (1993)'s defiance theory to apply to hunters' resistance. Pohja-Mykrä presented statistics and trends on dog kills by wolves, which have substantially increased in the past years. This is often cited as a basis for retaliatory killing of wolves (Peltola and Heikkilä, 2015). She also charted how the government had become increasingly cognizant and concerned about the illegal killing dimension of wolf management, from having made no mention of it at all in a government plan on wolf management from 2005 to devoting an entire chapter to it in the 2014 revision. This coheres with 2011's legal reform to treat illegal hunting of large carnivores as an aggravated offense. A slide in the powerpoint presentation also outlined the key social and natural science researchers on illegal hunting, wolf conservation and wildlife management in Finland for the participants' future reference.

RESEARCH ON WOLF CONFLICT	
NATURAL SCIENTISTS	SOCIAL SCIENTISTS
✓ Ilpo Kojola, Luke	✓ Pertti Rannikko, UEF
✓ Johanna Suutarinen, Luke	✓ Outi Ratamáki, UEF
✓ Jani Pellikka, Luke	✓ Taru Peltola, Finnish Environment Institute (SYKE)
✓ Sanna Ojalampi, Luke	✓ Suvi Borgström, SYKE
✓ Matti Salo, Luke	✓ Juha Hiedanpää, Natural Resources Institute Finland (Luke)
✓ Jukka Bisi, Metsähallitus	
✓ Sakari Mykrä, Univ. Turku	
✓ Jari Heikkilä, Univ. Helsinki	
✓ Mari Pohja-Mykrä, Ruralia Institute, Univ. Helsinki	
✓ Sami Kurki, RI, Univ. Helsinki	

Figure 1: Finnish researchers on illegal hunting.

Safety and fear

The discussion raised the matter of the safety and security discourse, asking if this was more prominent in Finland than in Norway or Sweden. This was based on recent activism on the part of parental associations capitalizing on fear for their children's safety in wolf-dense areas (Hiedanpää *et al.*, 2016). Indeed, these have provided driving forces behind protective culling of wolves in recent years. There is arguably also a stronger legacy of wolf attacks against humans in Finland (perhaps biased as a result of a few notable geographically limited historical events). Pohja-Mykrä suggested that the discourse on fear had not substantially increased in its opposition toward wolves or its salience, but quantitative results also indicated that whereas hunters and people generally had become more tolerant of wolves in situations with hunting dogs, they were not more averse to wolf attacks.

Argument	2014 (N=1618)	2016 (N=1665)
Wolves will lose their shyness towards humans if they are not hunted	26 %	34 %
Because wolves pose a threat to human safety	21 %	29%
Just because wolves are present	24 %	14 %
Because wolves pose a risk to domestic animals	31 %	14 %
Because wolves prey game animals	26 %	23 %

Figure 2: Acceptance of illegal killing of wolves.

The matter of dogs

The issue of hunting dogs or pet dogs at risk from wolves was also discussed in plenary. It was observed that we now know that more dogs are attacked by wolves because of the increased number of insurance claims on this matter. At the same time, Pohja-Mykrä's results show that hunting with dogs has increased in the past two years and, as mentioned, that the fear of one's dog getting attacked and killed by a wolf has paradoxically decreased. Pohja-Mykrä offered the explanation that fear levels may have decreased in this particular context as a result of a new online database that tracks the wolves' whereabouts and can thus help hunters plan ahead. A question was asked on what percentage of dogs survive versus die from wolf attacks. Pohja-Mykrä concluded that it was around fifty percent at present.

Policing Perspective on Illegal Hunting

Dr. Paul Larsson

Professor Paul Larsson, a criminologist based at Politihögskolan in Oslo, gave a talk that adopted a law enforcement perspective on illegal hunting. Interviews had been or were planned to be conducted with lawyers, attorneys, local police and special investigators under the Norwegian law-enforcement authorities EkoKrim and Statens Naturoppsyn. Larsson outlined the key challenges he saw to the reporting of illegal hunting. The particular case of the "twelve" suspected illegal hunters in Elverum in 2008-2016 was discussed in terms of its criminal investigation, court proceedings and final sentences for the convicted offenders.

The plenary discussion focused on the difficulty of enforcing hunting regulation and, in particular, enforcing effective sanctions and deterrents like depriving hunters of their right to hunt following indictments for hunting crimes. It was said that legally, such hunters are barred from paying the requisite annual state hunting sum—which is what allows one to hunt in the first place—but that there might be an issue where illegal hunters are criminals-at-large who do not pay taxes, pay this requisite fee, or

legally own firearms. It was also suggested that in cases where persons have had their weapons confiscated to preclude them from hunting, the efficiency of this needed to be questioned. If a person is accused of a hunting crime and is put under investigation and loses his weapons and license, he or she can continue to hunt but using, for example, dogs. Hence it was concluded that illegal hunting sanctions predicated on a certain morality and law-abidingness (or at least willingness to face one's conviction) on the part of hunters.

Snitching and wire-tapping

Wire-tapping is only permitted in extreme cases in Norway: if the crime can yield a punishment of ten years minimum. In Sweden, it is incumbent upon the district attorney to demonstrate that the defendant faces a crime which carries a possible sentence of at least a year of imprisonment, and it is still court that decides whether the wire-tap will go through or not. In Norway, the watershed illegal hunting case (of “the 12”) rested on the case tried as organized crime, which had enabled more sophisticated surveillance techniques in the criminal investigation.

Lastly, it was briefly discussed how illegal hunting becomes known to authorities, if not via the intensive strategy of wire-tapping. Do peers report each other? Interviews from Swedish hunters show that feuding neighbors are perhaps the leading reporters of hunting-related crime (albeit not necessarily large carnivore killing, since the survey would show that this crime is generally kept on the down-low from authorities). This has been observed in the case of illegal hunting in the US (Okihiro, 1997). But a law enforcement participant also shared that many illegal hunting crimes became known during divorce proceedings—much like faulty tax records.

Illegal Hunting as a Crime of Dissent

Dr. Erica von Essen

Erica von Essen's second presentation of the day was on illegal hunting in Sweden as a crime of dissent against a legitimacy crisis on the part of authorities. The presentation outlined the key empirical findings of the FORMAS research project: in-depth, semi-structured interviews with the Swedish hunting community broadly. Von Essen drew attention to different modes of protesting the Habitats Directive, why they looked the way they did, and what they accomplished. Within this, she presented the French Model as a symbolic, confrontational moral dialogue with politicians; the Italian Model as retreating from the state and adopting a ‘shoot, shovel, and shut up’ informal management of wolves on the countryside, and finally reflected on what might comprise the Swedish Model.

Here, the communicative dimensions of illegal hunting as a crime of dissent were emphasized: how, for example, there was a logic of shoot, shovel and shut up also in Sweden and that much like in Italy, Swedish hunters preferred to disengage from autho-

rities. However, proxy communication and discourse on illegal hunting were also discussed in terms of their sustaining a populist climate of distrust and sympathy toward illegal hunting among the Swedish hunting community (von Essen and Allen, 2015; von Essen, 2016b). The talk concluded by reflecting on constructive vs. destructive forms of dissent that hunters undertake to change wolf policy, stressing that the type of dissent manifested by Swedish hunters tended toward populism and political extremism (von Essen, 2016a). This was demonstrated in a slide featuring interview quotes around hunters casting their vote for the Swedish Democrats in protest of their disenfranchisement.

Why only hunters surveyed?

A question was raised regarding the respondent sample, which comprised of only hunters. A Dalarna representative and hunter suggested that in his county, illegal hunting of large carnivore like wolf was an issue that very much also implicated landowners and farmers. These had not been interviewed, for practical reasons for boundary-setting. But von Essen also argued on the basis of previous research that those engaging in illegal hunting were by and large legal, card-carrying hunters and that this was therefore the intuitive demographic to interview. She also argued that hunters were an important group to reach, because the actual illegal hunters in their midst could potentially only be deterred from these crimes if the attitude climate around them changed.

Hunters vs. the state

The role of the state returned as a discussion theme also in this session. One speculated that hunters and their communities may have a desire for autonomy in relation to state law (Krange and Skogen, 2011; von Essen and Hansen, 2016). Hence, there might be less willingness to come to the table and deliberate with state actors, because these are seen as fundamentally encroaching on hunting's jurisdiction. The state actors are often conflated as 'trolls, researchers, politicians and managers' as one participant said, who ought to leave hunters alone. Nevertheless, von Essen replied, wildlife and protected species are a public good in the present paradigm, and hunters' cannot be left to pursue their interests freely when their pursuit implicates a shared resource (Nurse, 2016b).

Poor management planning as driver to illegal kills

A connection to Krange's talk was made in the observation that in one Swedish county, the mixed signals sent by the managing authority regarding wolves was idiosyncratic and counterproductive, much like the Norwegian phenomenon of convicting a hunter for illegal hunting of wolves one year and then sanctioning a government cull of the same wolf pack the year after. In the Swedish case, which concerned the county of Jämtland, two genetically important wolves were petitioned for relocation by the Swedish Environmental Protection Agency, because they had strayed into Sami reindeer herding lands. Ultimately, however, these two genetically important wolves were subject to a protective cull on the part of the Sami villages. "So first these wolves cost 832 000 SEK each, and then you shoot them," the participant who provided the example said. He stressed that this was neither cost-effective management nor conducive to getting the support and trust of hunters and the public.

Hunters’ relationship to the ‘legal’

The plenary discussion also focused on the license cull appeals with the specific challenge of ‘how do we reclaim the wolf management issue as a public matter?’ This was premised on von Essen’s critique in her presentation that there had been an abandonment of the public when it came to wolf politics, and that such things were now resolved privately through ‘shoot, shovel and shut up’ or, as one participant observed, through courtrooms of appeals by ENGOs (von Essen and Allen, 2017). He argued that the appeals had taken the wolf discussion in a whole other direction—to becoming a matter of negotiating and stalling permits. He lamented this development as it stalled the real debate. Fifteen years ago, it was observed, the discussion was substantively about wolf management but today “it’s about something else entirely”. The phenomenon of juridification of wildlife management, as into higher-order courts of suits and counter-suits, was suggested as a US-based model that had grown in Europe in recent years, but was connected to juridification across several societal domains today (Kelemen and Sibbitt, 2004; Magnussen and Banasiak, 2013) not limited to species conservation policy.

The discussion turned toward the legality of hunters as a social group. The offenders behind shoot, shovel and shut up were speculated by one participant to be criminal-minded at large, fraudulent on their taxes and with violent misdemeanors in their ledger. The hunting community by and large comprised of law-abiding citizens. This group of offenders, it was surmised, would not be called “hunters” in the first place, but criminals.

Economically vs. politically motivated illegal hunting

There was some disagreement as to whether the symposium should focus also on non-carnivore ‘meat-poaching’. While the illegal hunting research project had been funded by FORMAS to look at all constituents of illegal hunting, von Essen and Hansen both clarified that it had *a priori* focus on illegal hunting that could be explicitly traced to problems with the legitimacy of law. Hence, hunters shooting a roe buck ten minutes after sunset was less interesting analytically for the symposium to engage with as a politically implicated crime. A hunter representative also argued that the large carnivore illegal hunting needed to be the main message in the discussion, because it represented a unique development in the hunting community. With this he meant that slob hunting and meat poaching were already widely condemned by hunters. It was a form of illegal hunting that would scarcely be sustained on the basis of socio-cultural neutralizations and sympathy from local communities. But oppositely, there was sympathy and support around wolf killings that made it a problematic breed of illegal hunting. He connected this to the premise that hunters were the ideal “nature inspectors” when it comes to unethical or illegal conduct in the woods, penetrating where law enforcement could never go, and that their attitudes toward certain hunting crimes or willingness to report or look the other way when faced with them were pivotal for a social control that could mitigate illegal hunting.

Renewed democratic procedures

The discussion turned finally to the role of democracy as a way forward to mitigate illegal hunting. Hansen emphasized that his experiences pointed toward need to reconcile hunters with the public discussion, and that the current premises for public participation were skewed and could not provide meaningful fora for debate (as for example the wildlife management delegations discussed by von Essen and Hansen, 2015). However, he expressed openness to alternative ideas coming out of the symposium. For one, it was observed by one participant that hunters were actually already onboard with the democratic approach and participated earnestly in county wildlife management delegations. But that it was the other side—of nature conservationists and ENGOs—that had decided to abandon democracy in favor of a more short-term legal strategy.

Day 2: Summary of Proceedings

Whose Resources?

Professor Tarla R. Peterson

The first presentation of the second day was given by Professor Tarla R. Peterson. She presented the case of illegal harvesting of natural resources, situating illegal hunting as one particular form of natural resource crime. Her presentation focused on poaching of pacific hawksbills seaturtle eggs in Central America, and the sorts of management and enforcement responses that had been devised to meet the challenge, including the development of hatcheries. Some optimistic ways forward were presented from a case in El Salvador, using citizen science and involvement in *in situ* protection of turtle eggs.

One discussion point that came out of this presentation was the outsider's perspective on illegal harvesting and its problems, causes and implications. It was observed that it is far easier for external researchers looking in on post-colonial countries or contexts and seeing the problems on the ground, including conflict and tension related to traditional resource use. But we turn a blind eye when it comes to our own national context.

Hunting, Wildlife and Ethics

Dr. Helena Nordström Källström

In two consecutive presentations, Dr Helena Nordström Källström and Dr M Nils Peterson outlined the the survey question design and the preliminary results of the survey respectively. The statistics were in early stages and this marked the first time they were presented to anyone outside of the FORMAS research group. Nordström Källström summarized the main themes of the survey, which provided basis for individual sections, including , 'respondent background', 'hunting ethics and values', 'faith in and legitimacy of authorities', 'political issues', 'attitudes toward on the wolf', 'reflections on the license

hunt’ and ‘attitudes on illegal hunting’. She presented the principal aims of the survey as (1) mapping the phenomenon of illegal hunting and hunters’ attitudes toward it; (2) quantifying occurrences of illegal hunting and (3) verifying findings and themes that had come out of the empirical study of interviews with Swedish hunters.

The Preliminary Survey Results

Dr. M Nils Peterson

Peterson presented survey statistics, beginning with demographic variables, such as income and education, gender and age. He went on to outline motivations behind hunting, how hunter respondents viewed ethics discussions within, the morality of different forms of technological aids, and how respondents had characterized the influence, power and trust of institutions on hunting issues.

Non-response rate

The issue of response rate was raised by participants. The survey had garnered just under fifty percent response rate (950 replies), which was seen as relatively good considering the divisive topic. It was first disseminated in May 2016, with two reminders. Generally, one observed that hunters may respond in numbers up to 60-70 percent, but with this survey’s focus on illegal hunting and attitude toward large carnivore like wolves among other things, a lower response rate was expected.

This was additionally a prediction made by the illegal hunting research project team before disseminating the survey, given that in the pilot phase of enlisting thirty or so hunters to provide responses, there had been a sizeable non-response rate motivated on the basis of suspicion toward the SLU researchers on the part of the hunter respondents. Hansen mentioned that a non-response analysis would be important to conduct, so that one may determine exactly who chose not to answer the survey.

Land ownership as category

In the plenary discussion, one reflection centered on the role of large landowners and their ownership distribution in Sweden. In the north, for example, some 90 percent of large forest companies own the land. It was therefore pointed out that hunters’ faith in landowners to make decisions regarding hunting and wolf management would have to take in a variety of large to small landowners, and that individual small holders might command significantly more legitimacy and trust than large forest companies. It was also observed that around half of all hunters, according to a participant, were themselves landowners, so the category was somewhat difficult to relate to as a distinct group. Additionally, one may not always be sure—as a hunter—who landowner was in all cases, and this has bearing on trust in this institution.

Trust in institutions

Of varying trust levels in general, participants were quick to see a geographical correlation in the survey results whereby the further away the authority or governing agency, the less legitimacy is commanded among Swedish hunters. This has been corroborated in the interviews, with low levels of trust in the EU and low perceptions of the EU valuing or acknowledging the local embodied knowledge or values of hunters in relation to wolves (von Essen, 2016b). Other reflections included an interest in seeing how the survey results would appear if sent to non-hunters, as members of the general public, though others observed that several of these questions would be irrelevant or nonsensical to non-hunters and had been developed with them specifically in mind. Nevertheless, the public's trust in different authorities and attitudes toward different hunting crimes and different animals would have been interesting to canvas.

Nordström Källström drew attention to a potentially problematic conflation of environmental non-governmental organizations and animal rights associations, which was presented in one category in the trust section of the survey. Indeed, she conceded that hunting associations typically thought of themselves as environmental non-governmental associations³, and that the Swedish question had therefore been more sensitive in its wording to this distinction (unlike the PPT in English).

Social control among hunters

Finally, participants discussed around hunters' varying willingness to report a fellow hunter to the authority over his or her transgression, versus 'doing nothing' or handling it internally in the team. Here, it was not surprising given earlier presentations on 'shoot, shovel and shut up', that large carnivore kills were not addressed in the open. Some misdemeanors demanded social sanctions, however. Other technically illegal conduct, like raising a baiting camera without permit, were thought little of by Swedish hunters, as evidenced in the high numbers sold and few permits obtained.

³ They are presently not eligible for this status and standing under the Aarhus Convention, for example.



Figure 3: Hans Peter Hansen raises the issue of the future.

Ways Toward Legitimate Wildlife Management

Dr. Hans Peter Hansen

Hans Peter Hansen concluded the formal presentations of day 2. His talk focused on the future, looking at the illegal hunting phenomenon in a change perspective. He adopted a long-term mitigation strategy, less focused on immediate deterrence, and more around granting uptake to hunters who felt disenfranchised, and creating new spaces for engagement among citizens. He drew on successful Finnish experiences of doing so, but also on experiences from a workshop with local community members in Trysil, Norway, emphasizing that under the right conditions, local citizens critical to the existing wolf management, could be made to deliberate civilly with other interest groups, though it was a challenge.

The challenge needed to be addressed in institutional reform of alternative spaces for public participation—spaces which were not preordained with tensions, conflict and predetermined stakeholders poised against one another (Hansen *et al.*, 2016). Hansen noted that the situation with illegal hunting in Finland had immensely improved during a phase of such experimental citizen talks, and that Sweden may want to follow suit in pioneering new democratic avenues for participation. He grounded his arguments also on democratic theory, emphasizing that current management had adopted a vertical representative democracy approach (see stakeholder model) when it should cultivate the horizontal dimension between equal citizens. One possible approach to this was to explore the potential of the Critical Utopian Dialogue Approach, as had been applied in Trysil and had been partly successful in

establishing common ground, a sense of ownership and civic responsibility on the part of participants.

Hansen's talk was a precursor to a combined lunch and afternoon session devoted to group work among the invited participants. These groups would focus on the emergent themes of the symposium so far, but also adopt a change-oriented perspective.

Group-based Discussions

Cross-disciplinary, multi-national, cross-agency were constituted by the research project leaders to provide mini 'think tanks' for the second day's proceedings. Groups could move about freely in the building and were instructed to present the key points of their discussions in the plenary session in the afternoon concluding the symposium.



Figure 4: Group presentations.



Figure 5: Group presentations.

Group 1

In the first group to present, the speaker discussed the role of inertia and rigidity in the decision-making system where wolves and wildlife conservation were concerned, and noted that the group's internal discussions had inevitably turned to the European Union. Indeed, while there was distrust of authorities in general, much of this seemed to be able to be traced back to the EU level. In particular, they observed that many of the conservation directives did now no longer correspond to reality, as when protected species had proliferated to the point of becoming a pest, like the cormorant.

The role of technical-ecological assessments for Favourable Conservation Status (FCS)

They raised the issue of whether more robust scientific assessments solved the problem, but plenary discussions indicated that the wolf issue was no longer one of science but of politics and law. Indeed, it was observed that competing scientific assessments and evidence bases, like FCS, were now becoming a matter of power play rather than as




Figure 6: Group 1's discussion points.

something that informed solutions. They agreed that there was plenty of information about large carnivores, and that the deficit lay not in information but in democracy and its practical application.

Group 1 also mentioned the state appropriation of the wolf to the point where it was no longer seen as the locals resource, connecting to a discussion on the previous day about the ownership of protected wildlife (von Essen and Allen, 2016): as “their” wolves, “their pets” and more. They raised the issue and case of Malta, where social control has been successful in mitigating illegal hunting of birds (Raine *et al.*, 2016)

A legacy of mistrust

Finally, they asked whether distrust would fizzle out with time or whether resentment created a legacy of distrust also for future management and decisions, who inherited poor relations with local communities. In the interviews of the illegal hunting project, it was clear that past mistakes were costly to the present and future credibility of a state agency, such as the SEPA.

Group 2

Group two's discussions points focused on the institutional and governance dimension of wolf and wildlife management, asking what sorts of administrative agencies, civil servants and competences were sought. They discussed these against a background of criticisms by hunters that current agencies were defunct, lacking in legitimacy, or producing decisions that were likely to be legally overturned in the system. Thus, they emphasized the need for a coherent state apparatus for decision-making and management where wolf was concerned. Within this they raised the issue of the potential new Wildlife Management Agency, which constitutes a talking point in the current wolf debate. It was first suggested as a result of partial completion of the evaluation of the hunting legislation two years back, which had subsequently been abandoned or disbanded, and the matter of a new agency had been shelved.




Figure 7: Group 2's discussion points.

Getting off on the right foot with a new agency

The group had some misgivings toward this new agency. Were it ever to materialize, it had to avoid the problems of the present management. For example, the recruitment basis of personnel had to move away from people of pure ecology/biology backgrounds; expectations around what could and could not be done in wolf management needed to be clarified from an early point so as to avoid the trap that the wildlife management delegations fell into thinking they could influence more than their mandate decreed (von Essen and Hansen, 2015). To this end, there was some disagreement about the jurisdiction of the Swedish Hunting Association within the group and within the plenary discussion that followed. There was a will on the one hand to retain a strong civil society presence as an ENGO, and on the other hand as working more closely with the new wildlife management agency in a consultative capacity, in an extension of its commission.

Detaching from polemic wolf issues

It was also suggested that whatever participatory arenas associated with this organ, they would do well to either move away from wolf issues by framing it as wildlife management broadly, making things less polemic from the outset—or they needed to clearly set aside wolf-only deliberative spaces. It was noted in the discussion, however, that the latter configurations tended to be infected with misgivings and tensions from the start (as in e.g. Hansen *et al.*, 2016).

The group concluded by problematizing to whom the wolf management issue should belong, observing that the current juridification had displaced their issue into courts.

Group 3

To group 3, illegal hunting was presented as a leading problem for hunters' credibility, and thus to the survival and legitimacy of the hunting institution in the future. They emphasized that laws were not reasonable at present, and that ways forward had to involve the increased inclusivity and participation of locally affected people.

Bridging practice and research—making research accessible

In the discussion that followed, participants emphasized the importance of communicating scientific research in an accessible way to practitioners on the ground if any progress were to be made. Civil servants were pressed for time, and an ideal format for reading scientific recommendations were short, action-oriented guidance documents in Swedish. This was compared to the present situation, in which lengthy academic dissertations in English or peer-reviewed articles would never find their way to their desks. Within this one emphasized the importance of 'samhällsnyttig' research, i.e. research that had an impact on management for the better, and did not operate in academic bubbles.

Civil servants working with researchers

This point raised a discussion in plenary over the possibility of initiating research on the grassroots and practitioner level from the outset. Collaborative, action-based research projects might prove important in bridging the divide between academics and prac-

titioners seeking to implement their research in their everyday praxis. “Common fact finding”, for example, was cited as a potential collaborative research strategy in which the people on the ground—the directly affected—could co-constitute research projects by formulating the problems as they saw them.

Group 4

Group 4 began by partly questioning the working premise to much of the symposium, namely, that that illegal hunting of wolves constituted political resistance. They noted the breadth of motives behind such crimes, and raised the issue of economically-motivated poaching of ungulates in Southern and Middle Sweden. They connected to an ongoing discussion of the symposium of whether such forms of illegal hunting should be within the remit of the discussion, as it may be less explicitly motivated by legitimacy crisis and disenfranchisement on the part of offenders. Nevertheless, its occurrence was seen as a serious problem.

Inconsistencies and poor planning

Group 4 also presented their discussions around the flimsiness of the state in relation to the wolf question in particular. Here, their critique and primary point for improvement pertained to the need of the state to send clear and consistent signals regarding management, as opposed to going back and forth inconsistently. They cited the example of the Norwegian wolf referred to earlier in the symposium, whose killing was criminalized one day and endorsed as a matter of culling by the government the next. On the whole, they argued, there was a wish for the government to adopt a firm position and deliver on promises made. When decisions were taken, they needed to be followed through and not abandoned or undermined, questioned or investigated, in other parts of the decision-making apparatus.

Group 5

The wolf as symbol of oppression

Group 5 brought attention to, first, the symbolic role of the wolf in the present conflict across the Nordic countries. They stated it had taken on connotations of a much bigger socio-political struggle in the respective countries. Consequently it was difficult to divorce the wolf as an animal from this context today. Within this, they elaborated also on the economic injustices and lack of proportions that characterized wolf management expenditures on the countryside, like spending several hundred thousand SEK on a single wolf family and then having it shot. They argued current management actions were far from cost-effective. Apart from serving conservation poorly, the high costs were also a source of alienation to hunters and rural communities. This much is corroborated by the project interviews (von Essen, 2016b). They also directed critique toward legal appeals. They observed that the judiciary realm would constitute a principal battleground for the wolf issue in the coming years, based on present tendencies. Second, group 5 also stressed

that there was a preoccupation with illegal killings of wolves, as the crime is broad and may concern multiple species, as also mentioned by the preceding group 4.

Practicing social control among hunters

They concluded their presentation by summarizing their discussions on ethics within the hunting community. They asked how and to what extent it may improve and become robust enough to constitute a means of social control to mitigate illegal hunting. This predicated on the importance of social norms and peer pressure to hunters, more so than formal laws (von Essen and Hansen, 2016). At present, there was an aversion on the part of hunters to report illegal hunting in their communities. This, they argued, was one key challenge to address. The role of large landowners was also mentioned in relation to social control in hunting communities locally. “You could say, ‘you do this illegal hunting and you won’t be allowed to hunt here for the next three years.’ I think that’s the best way to reduce the acceptance [of illegal hunting] in society.”

Group 6

Much like group 3, group 6 feared for the impact of wolf killing on the reputation of the hunting community. However, group 6 argued that this was not a problem to impact only illegal hunting, but also followed legal wolf culls. On the level of individual hunters, one observed, few would openly admit to participation in legal culls for fear of public reprisals. Law enforcement representatives in the group stated that they had handled a large number of threats made against wolf hunters, and that there was nothing “proud about showing off as a wolf hunter” in the present climate.

Back into practice

Continuing their reflections around legal vs. illegal hunting, group 6 stressed that one mitigation for illegal hunting was to legalize it, at least to a greater extent than the limited cull that took place today. Like group 4, they had critical reflections around the juridification of management. They suggested it complicated the relationship between political decisions and litigation, skewing management too far in favor of the latter development. While this phenomenon was innately political as well, it did not have the legitimacy of formal state decision-making. “The politics have come to an end in Sweden—I mean it’s all legal stuff now.” Like group 5, they wondered about the next step in this development.




Figure 8: Group 6's Discussion Points

Community acceptance of illegal killing

Group 6 also presented discussion points on the role of the countryside in neutralizing or otherwise permitting illegal hunting—via tacit acceptance, silence or unwillingness to report. Whereas other crimes—like child abuse—would quickly become locally known, “you shoot a wolf and no questions are asked.” At the same time, they observed that the entire countryside (including livestock farming associations) may be too readily accused of being complicit in the crime. The actual ‘support’ for illegal hunting given by the countryside or by local communities was extremely complex.

Group 7

Informing about the negative impacts of illegal killings

Similar to group 6, group 7 raised reflections on the impact of illegal hunting on the license cull. They cited concerns that illegal hunting would undermine legal hunting, as when genetically important wolves had fallen victim to ‘shoot, shovel and shut up’ subsequent culls that may have targeted entire packs would not be able to proceed due to the new compromised genetic situation. Hence the group emphasized the importance of communicating this to the hunting community. If it could be shown clearly that illegal hunting ultimately put them in a worse situation, with more wolves than would otherwise be permitted, acceptance for illegal hunting might decline. Indeed, it would be seen as a grave offense and disservice to the community to do so. Group 7 connected this to a broader discussion of their on social control and acceptance of compliance and non-compliance in local communities, asking how one might best change this.

But they also raised discussion points about needing to reach beyond hunters. The broader public had to be engaged and educated. This extended to clear information of what management entailed, the role that hunting/culling played in management (as not a purely negative force), and timely reports of management decisions. Beyond the education and information dimension, the importance of democratic dialogue was also raised.

Group 8

Who qualifies as directly affected

In group 8, participants engaged in a discussion about the concept of ‘directly affected’. Who qualified for this status in the wolf situation, and whom did it exclude? Group 8 argued that at present it was easy for anyone and everyone to chime in on the debate with an opinion, without having anything to lose in the situation.

A contested term, ‘directly affected’ nevertheless had bearing on whom should be given decision-making mandate and to what degree. To this end, while hunters and livestock farmers were clearly affected by wolf decisions, the case could also be made that the Swedish public and ENGOs had a stake in the well-being of wolf populations, “a public good” in the current paradigm (Nurse, 2016a). In this way, it could not be governed autonomously by rural communities entirely.

The spreading silence and refusal to discuss

A point around the need to re-engage democratically was raised. This was predicated on the de facto silencing of the current political conversation over wolves, which needed to be restarted in society. The current silence, one argued, was understandable but ultimately a choice that was not conducive to long-term solutions or co-existence (“The silence is the worst bit”). The group agreed that interest parties had increasingly positioned themselves in trenches and that any civil engagement on the level of dialogue was now rare. Referring to the relative success of dialogue processes on the citizen level in the context of Finnish wolf management, similar ideas were entertained for e.g. Sweden and Norway.

Identifying the ‘right’ talk

To find common ground through such processes, one suggested that the framing of participation needed to change; it had to have a point of entry that was not an *a priori* infected topic (i.e. wolf) but use less contested issues to engage people. At the same time, the plenary discussion emphasized the danger of ‘all talk’ and stressed the importance of linking dialogue processes to actionable decisions, influence and management approaches.

Back to the basics for clarity

Group 8 also raised the issue of clarity, consistency and long-term planning on the part of state agencies and government, against critiques that back-and-forthness created insecurity and doubt. Clarity and unity, it was suggested, could include considering the establishment of one authority (Wildlife Management Agency in Sweden) to oversee and coordinate all affairs, or simply sticking to one law, one verdict, and the word of one minister. Above all, group 8 emphasised going back to examining the ‘basic idea’ behind the directives that now applied—what did one really hope to achieve, and how might we get back on track to realize this?

Group 9

The rhetoric of radicals

The last group to present was an international selection of participants who focused, first, on the false consensus effect. This meant reflecting critically about the role and influence of social media discussions on wolf hating, illegal hunting and government distrust on actual occurrences of the crime. False consensus refers to the belief of people that other people hold views more similar to theirs than they really do; it is the overestimation of similarity in behavior, thought or position (Mannarini *et al.*, 2015). For the wolf issue, loud and inflammatory rhetoric on social media may have exerted a radicalizing effect on ordinary hunters. Alternatively, the group observed, the presence of this talk on social media channels may distort the public’s perception around the actual support for and willingness to undertake illegal hunting among average hunters.

Signals sent by the state

The group presented a question that had come out of their discussions, namely: what are the effects of convicting “good” people or, alternatively, of not convicting them? What signals does this send, and what is most productive? It is observed that it can be impairing to state legitimacy if the criminal justice system targets people who are generally seen by the broader public or by their communities as good and honest people, as otherwise law-abiding citizens, or similar. At the same time, looking the other way send a problematic signal about the laws that concern them being illegitimate in the first place, and that the government’s tacit condoning of illegal hunting as in Italy, was not a situation in which one wanted to end up (Vitali, 2014). Finally, the group reflected on ways forward for management in the future. They asked whether it is productive at this point to try to seek substantive solutions to the problem of wolves, versus trying to find some sort of agreement on process and working arrangement to get to future substantive solutions collaboratively.

Synthesizing discussion

In what follows, the symposium themes are synthesized. They have been identified on the basis of transcripts of notes and a review of all group presentations.

“The Elephant in the Room” —the European Union

The European Union constituted a frequent topic at the symposium. It did so principally in four topics of discussion: (1) the practical implications of Norway’s non-membership, (2) the rigidity and outdatedness of conservation directives, (3) the EU having differential standards of accommodation of illegal hunting across member states and (4) to what extent Nordic hunters and affected need to become more visible on the EU level to influence policy and politics around wolf management, as via e.g. FACE or the Nordic Hunters Alliance.

Norway’s non-membership

First, the inclusion of Norwegian representatives in the symposium helped place the European Union and its influence on wolf conservation and illegal hunting in perspective. Norway is not a member of the EU and, as such, can cull wolves in greater numbers (as via its zoning policy) than either Sweden or Finland who are signatories of the Habitats Directive. At the same time, Norway’s wolf population is protected by the Bern Convention and also shared with Sweden, which means that what happens on the Norwegian side has implications on an EU level issue and vice versa. Discussions which raised the feasibility of managing wolves more collaboratively across the border frequently met the problem of EU membership. To what extent can the shared wolf population also be co-managed across Sweden and Finland given the current legislative arrangement? The EU may be said to invisibly bind both member states and in some cases adjacent member states to directives without those countries having signed them nationally.

Revising the directives

Because all conservation directives and legal appeals could ultimately be traced to the EU level and to phrasing in the Habitats Directive, a joint feeling at the symposium was that the directives themselves needed to be problematized and evaluated with respect to their practical relevance and legitimacy. We saw that several discussions centered on the need for updating, revising or ameliorating directives by the approach of, first, clarifying what it was that it set out to accomplish, and two, examining if interim accomplishments had been achieved and merited revisions in the protected status of some species. The wolf was not actually the center of this discussion, but rather the status of some bird species (also subject to illegal hunting) was seen as problematically outdated. Indeed, interviews in the research project have revealed strongly resentful attitudes and feelings of betrayal on the part of hunters in relation, for example, to woodcock hunting prohibition and similar protected status afforded to corvid species.

It can be noted that the EU has undertaken a fitness check of the Habitats and Birds Directive 2015–2016 with this explicit purpose in mind. In December 2016, the final verdict of several phases to this evaluation was published, after completion in mid-2016. It concluded that the directives “remain highly relevant and are fit for purpose”. At the same time, caveats were added to emphasize that practical implementation of directives needed to improve, particularly by working in closer “partnership with local authorities and different stakeholders in the Member States to deliver practical results on the ground for nature, people and the economy in the EU.” The verdict may exasperate some participants of the symposium, given they declared that one could only do so much within the parameters of the EU directives today, and that supranational level revisions were ultimately required to facilitate changes and improvement regionally.

It is worth noting, however, that the EU seems at least minimally cognizant of some of the issues of the directives and their role in potentially leading to illegal hunting. For one, in an earlier report, they suggest that legal appeals of license culls are an “unintended effect related to the enforcement system,” (European Environment on Environment, 2015, p. 17). They also note, in agreement with points raised at the symposium, that EU conservation policy have effected a problematic single focus on the wolf as the flagship species of conservation. In particular, its self-critique in the evaluation of the Habitats Directive is that in member states there has been a tendency to individualize and sentimentalize wolves and lose sight of the bigger picture. Among other things, the evaluation suggests that this has resulted in “an overly risk-averse approach to dealing with impacts on some protected species, such that the focus is on individuals rather than marinating the conservation status of the population concerned” (European Commission on Environment, 2015, p. 15).

Injustice and unfairness between member states

The third theme raised in conjunction with discussions on the EU was that of the Commission seemingly employing inconsistent standards of accommodation for wolf culling across its member states. The French Model and the Italian Model of dealing

with the wolf situation had been raised early in the symposium, and gave rise to reflections on the different ways that European states cope with their wolf numbers. It was said that the EU implicitly and tacitly tolerated the Italian's 'shoot, shovel, and shut up' countryside management of wolves, because they did not even try to get a legal, licensed cull underway politically. Previous studies have termed this phenomenon one of "benign neglect" on the part of the state toward illegal hunting: prohibition in the official discourse but tacitly tolerated on the countryside (Boitani, 2000; Vitali, 2014)

In the French case, it was suggested that the French would not be pushed around by the EU Parliament, by having a politically empowered rural sector that could mobilise farming and hunting interests. Subsequently, there was greater toleration of wolf killings in southern Europe than in the Nordic countries. Nordic countries (especially Sweden) worked earnestly for a legal hunt but were ultimately shut down. The signal this sent, to several participants, was that illegal management of wolves on the countryside was the preferred approach by the EU. Swedish willingness to be best in class was also theorized to extend to the genetic mapping and monitoring of its wolf population. This meant that mismanagement, disappearances of wolves and genetic vulnerabilities could be quickly detected and sanctioned, compared to the situation elsewhere in Europe where genetic and ecological data was scarce.

Communicating rural concerns to the EU

Fourth and finally, the EU was frequently raised in discussions about how to move forward in mitigating illegal hunting on the one hand, and creating acceptance and legitimacy for wolf conservation on the other hand. As per the discussion on the rigidity of the conservation directives, there was agreement these needed to be overseen. It can be noted that the symposium took place two weeks before the EU had published its final verdict of its own fitness check, concluding no such structural changes were required. But there was also an emerging discussion predicated on the sober realization that hunting associations had perhaps no choice but to become more strategic players on the EU playing field, to off-set their disadvantages nationally against ENGOS. There have been limited discussions so far about the potential benefits of FACE as a platform for such political mobilization. In fact, FACE works with an inter-hunting group engaged directly in Parliament, and is constituted by European hunters broadly. Because of its dimension also of conservation, it may be poised to influence such directives.⁴

But that which strengthens the power of FACE to influence potentially also undermine it in this question: comprising of all member states' hunting organizations, it has many topics that receive stronger impetus for lobbying than the wolf issue as it looks

4 As, in, for example the FACE-organized conference "The Future of the Nature Directives: Where are we going?" Tuesday, 7th March 2017, European Parliament, Brussels.

in the Nordic countries. Indeed, it may be pertinent for Nordic hunters—including Norway—to explore coalitions on their own that they can then take to FACE. For example, the as yet underexplored Nordic Hunters Alliance which today represents some 600,000 hunters in Sweden, Norway, Finland, Denmark and Iceland.

Social Control among Hunters

The symposium had begun with a quote from the interview study of the FORMAS project: “There are no police in the woods”. It set the stage for further reflections on the limitations of law enforcement in rural communities over the next two days. The policing oriented presentation by Professor Larsson emphasized the difficulty that law enforcement faced in the context of policing illegal hunting, citing solidarity, silence and complicit communities as principal barriers. This was confirmed in day two’s presentation of the preliminary survey results, where hunters showed unwillingness to take legal action toward e.g. illegal killing of wolves. It was something that was handled internally in the team or, more frequently, something which was not spoken of at all. Part of the reason for this may have been a sense of self-preservation; as discussions during the symposium showed, publicizing illegal hunting was extremely costly and counterproductive for the hunting collective.

A complex system of informal norms

A hunting representative at one point argued that “hunters are the most effective nature inspectors” when it comes to cleaning up misconduct. This is affirmed in the FORMAS project’s results and reports, which show sophisticated internal social sanctioning systems for lapses in judgment, ethics or character when hunting (von Essen and Hansen, 2016). Social control is not to be dismissed lightly as inferior or stepping in only when formal laws and enforcement are seen as illegitimate or inapplicable. As discussions revealed, the informal system of do’s and don’ts among hunters tends to exhibit a greater range of taboos than formal rules cover, including hunting in ways that break social convention or denote ineffective, aesthetically poor or wasteful killing (Kaltenborn *et al.*, 2013). One of the reasons why some participants did not overly worry about commercially-driven, meat-based poaching of ungulates to the same degree as large carnivore killings was that the former was widely condemned in the collective. Inasmuch as it would survive, it would do so opportunistically and evasively and without the moral support of the community of hunters behind it. It was unequivocally wrong.

The inflammatory rhetoric as unhelpfully radicalizing

The challenge is to transfer the stigma and social taboo of poaching also onto the large carnivore killing context. Previous discussions and presentations had highlighted the fact that illegal hunters may overestimate the support they receive from the hunting (and local) community, who are in fact not complicit or in support of their crimes. Group 9, in particular, cautioned about the false consensus effect. Some reasons why this overestimation of the support or occurrence of illegal hunting may include the presence of loud, regime-critical contributions of hunters in social media. The reality, one suggested, was that most hunters abhor illegal hunting of wolves and would tolerate it only under extreme circumstances. This coheres with the findings from the interview study, where few respondents expressed an outright support for the act (von Essen, 2016b). They rationalized it only to the extent it was a last resort and that it was done without inflicting cruelty. Dr. Pohja-Mykrä's scenario-based interview technique with Finnish hunters yielded similar results, though showed Finns were potentially more sympathetic toward illegal killings of wolves (Pohja-Mykrä and Kurki, 2014).

Given Swedish hunters tend to strongly disagree with the premises of wolf management and the legal directives surrounding its protection, it is perhaps unfeasible that social control could be encouraged on the basis of obeying the law on its own (though this virtue should also not be dismissed in the context of Nordic communities, as shown in e.g. Gezelius and Hauck, 2011; Boonstra *et al.*, 2016), much less for the sake of a thriving wolf conservation. Clearly, the law is not legitimate, and hunters may show an increasing aversion to the reach of law into their domain in the first place. There is little support for wolf conservation.

Channeling social control to sanction illegal hunting

But there may be other dimensions to hunters' morality in which social control could be productively channeled to condemn wolf killing. This is on two points: the bio-centric-egalitarian, and the ecocentric. Hunters are increasingly concerned with animal welfare and showcase stringent standards for hunting in a way that does not entail suffering: for example, swift deaths, sustained tracking efforts, not shooting a sow or cow with young offspring, and using the right ammunition for the right game. Wolf killings have at least a reputation for violating some of these standards and standards of 'fair chase'; they have been pursued via snowmobiles, they have been clubbed to death, there is talk about shooting them in the belly so that they have time to bolt and die slowly on someone else's land.

On the basis of hunters' piety toward wildlife welfare, then, one might expect that the unaesthetic, sloppy and even cruel ways in which wolves are (allegedly) illegally killed may be what triggers social sanctions—rather than the killing of a wolf itself. This would be contingent on continuing to work with ethics and moral development within the hunting collectives across the Nordic countries. This much is endorsed by the hunting institutions. Separate investments on the part of both the Danish Hunting Association and the Swedish Hunting Association to work to cultivate hunting ethics

have been promoted in two initiatives that span several years: in ‘jakt etiket’ and ‘etiketsatsningen’ respectively (Råd, 2010). Applying the ethics dimension onto the social control around illegal hunting to shame them predicate on the premise that “there is even honor amongst thieves” (Eliason, 2013), but this may be difficult where wolf hunters for example are criminals at large, poorly bonded to society or even to their local communities (von Essen *et al.*, 2014).

Second, on an ecocentric or ‘bigger picture’ rationale, hunters would oppose illegal killings of wolves on the basis of inviting negative effects in the long-term. That is, if sufficiently informed about the community of wolves and their pack structures, they would be less likely to target genetically important wolves in their illegal hunting for fear of negating conservation efforts and incurring greater costs to themselves as a result of this. Indeed, this would be seen as doing the rural community and hunters a disservice, as it would undermine any legal culling they might be allowed for the population. This was the case for example on Malta, where illegal killings of birds (some of which pertained to the reintroduced Italian conservation effort) resulted in a sanction upon the hunting community: their legal hunting season was cut short by the government (Raine *et al.*, 2016). Collective punishment may thus be a way, although it needs to be complemented by other non-criminal justice approaches.

Working with social control as means of mitigating illegal hunting will not take place overnight. It is sensitive to other cultural and interpersonal factors. It also relies on either the greater numeracy of hunters standing against a certain act or crime, or a person with great local authority (such as a respected hunting team leader or large landowner) to do so. This begs the question of how these people are to be identified and reached. However, given strong social norms against freeloading or hunting in improper and non-discriminate ways current deter many forms of (illegal) hunting the utility of this approach should be explored for large carnivores. If it can be re-framed in a language that resonates with hunters’ norms against freeloading (i.e. it’s seen as taxing the collective), it may be efficient (Gezelius and Hauck, 2011).

Juridification of Wolf Management and its Implications

A frequently discussed topic at the symposium was the legal appeals by ENGOs filed to trigger injunctions to stop license wolf hunts. This most frequently occurs in Sweden, as Norway’s ENGOs cannot appeal to the Habitats Directive to argue the cull compromises favorable conservation status. In Finland, license culls have been more successful as cull decisions for the winter are announced in the summer months, and any appeals filed in the meantime will have been settled by the time the cull is slated to begin. In Sweden, ENGOs appeal right before a hunt begins and rely on the emergency injunction to stall the hunt to the point where it could no longer go through, such as due to snow cover loss disabling tracking.

Views on ENGO litigation strategy

The Aarhus Convention that grants ENGOs (of a certain standing and membership count) the ability to contest decisions on behalf of environmental matters like wildlife conservation (Epstein and Darpö, 2013) is clearly here to stay. ENGOs have become relatively successful litigants when compared to other appellants (Jans and Marseille, 2010). This has led to critiques of their saboteurist dispositions through “lawfare” (Comaroff, 2001). In the plenary discussions of the symposium, legal appeals of this kind were sometimes conceded as the legitimate rights of ENGOs, as all have a right to legal appeals. But the particular brand of obstructionist appeals filed to stop the license wolf hunts was disparaged as overriding or abandoning democracy. It was even seen as the cessation of politics (in the law-making sense) and the beginning of juridification of societal issues. Wolf management, in effect, migrated into courts. With this, hunting leaders are replaced by judges, and landowners are replaced by attorneys.

Putting democracy out of play

Two things may be important for ENGOs to secure with their legal appeals, apart from the injunction that stops the hunt. Some argue this injunction is all they are after—a kind of direct action. But an important thing to secure in the long-term for these ENGOs is popular support, as from the non-hunting public. This was clearly a factor in Sweden’s first 2010 legal battle over the license cull, where there was sympathy over unlawfully killed wolves (who were not viable enough in their population numbers) and concerns about inciting the wrath of the EU Commission on the Environment for violating the Habitats Directive. Yet it was discussed that years later, these legal appeals may exert a tiring and antagonizing effect on the public for jerking hunters around. At least, there appears to be less media coverage around the event in mainstream media that portray it as a grave crime toward wolves (von Essen and Allen, 2017). The second thing that ENGOs arguably need to obtain with their appeal is the backing of the EU Commission. Indeed, their appeal rests on the presumption that the Commission can punish and fine member states from derogating from the Habitats Directive via license culls.

The need for closure

The problem from an ENGO point of view is that so far, the EU Commission has lacked teeth in following up its stern warnings to Sweden and Finland with any legal or monetary repercussions. This not only robs the appeals of legitimacy and weight, but questions the EU’s commitment to enforcement of the directive in the first place. Some participants at the symposium suggested that rather than being kept in legal limbo with ENGOs filing hit-and-run appeals that did not go anywhere (beside result in stopping the cull, their perhaps principal aim), the time had come to actually systematically raise and deliberate over the cull and its appeal process in EU level courts to resolve things once and for all. Clearly, though, this is a risky strategy for hunters who wish for license culls in the future to take. Others showed more faith in the recent

developments on the national and regional level to delimit appeals (such as by deciding SEPA decisions are not able to be overturned by the higher courts), but noted this did not go all the way.

The future around license culls was uncertain. But what was certain was that the current juridification of management—courtroom conservation—would continue to increase unless firm political action was taken to prevent it from doing so. It connected to a discussion among hunters that they, too, perhaps had to become more skilled legal players. Fundamentally, however, the symposium participants all agreed it was an unfortunate development that took wolf management away from affected people and regions and into higher courts with bureaucrats. It was not a game in which they wished to become more proficient, emphasizing instead the need to reclaim the matter from the courts back to a public discussion, or “back to democracy”.

Future perspectives on the mitigation of illegal hunting

Several elements in time and space were pointed out as crucial for the reproduction of sociopolitical drivers to illegal killings. They were hence identified as components to be addressed on different levels in order to deal more constructively with illegal hunting. These elements included the role of EU and the shortcomings of the implementation of directives rather than the substantive content of the directives, the role of social control and trust, and the role of the recent years’ juridification of wildlife management. But the importance of the everyday life perspective and of science and research were discussed.

Reclaiming legitimacy

As already noted some of the participants disputed the concept of political resistance as a concept applicable in relation to illegal hunting. There was nevertheless consensus that some types of illegal hunting were sociopolitically driven and that these types had to do with the legitimacy of the decision-making and law enforcement in the wildlife context. Although the legal legitimacy might be fulfilled and perhaps even reinforced by an increased juridification—as it is the case in the Swedish wolf management context—this does not necessarily meet the experienced injustice for those citizens who feel that they have to bear the costs for decisions made by others based on perceived inadequate or unexposed premises. This perspective on political legitimacy is one that emphasizes legitimacy as something beyond a matter of mere legal legitimacy.

Added to the lack of legitimacy the perception of scant political recognition, social regulation is decreasing and the mistrust in the procedural dynamics of the public sphere and public governmental institutions is increasing with potentially devastating consequences on different levels. On the management level, it results in inefficient

management programs, and on the societal level it results in political populism. From the perspective of the hunting community, the symposium illuminated the risk that a continuation of illegal hunting would not only lead to distrust also for future management and decisions, but also to negative publicity and decreased credibility of hunters by the rest of society. This risk is reinforced by the ongoing media debate that perhaps gives the public a false impression of consensus among hunters around the actual support for and willingness to undertake illegal actions.

Integrating the Everyday Life perspective in policy and research

There was a general agreement that the problem of sociopolitically driven illegal hunting was not a matter of insufficient scientific knowledge or gaps in wildlife research, but more a matter of coherence between the values and goals on the overarching institutional level, and the possibility to implement those values and goals. This might not necessarily have to do with the values and goals of the directive itself, but more with how the directive is presented, enacted and enforced by governing agencies. For that reason, a stronger sensitivity and better understanding of the everyday reality of those citizens who affected by the implementation is profoundly required at the EU level.

The inadequate legal system and escalating juridification of wolf management also call for significant changes. The continued appeals made by some ENGOs of decisions made by country administrative boards is seen as systematically distorted communication by legal means and was at the symposium argued to be counterproductive in the sense that it is increasingly presents illegal hunting as the only doable option to achieve culling of wolves.

Beyond clarity, consistency and long-term planning on the part of state agencies and government, we contend that the assurance of a better unity in the wildlife management, including increased trust and more robust means of social control to mitigate illegal hunting, can only be met by increased the inclusivity and participation of locally affected people. For that participatory arenas for deliberation and joint fact finding are required. Not as exclusive arenas for decision-making, but as arenas for (re)activating the political debate on the commons (such as wolves and local landscapes); for identifying sustainable solutions in the intersection between nature and culture such as wildlife management and for developing a sense of ownership, not only on the material level but also on the procedural level. It has been argued that such arenas do not exist but have to be actively developed as new initiatives. Lastly, importance of praxis-relevant 'samhällsnyttig' research was emphasized.

In the Swedish context, the establishment of a new institutional wildlife management level in 2009, the so-called wildlife delegations, was discussed as potential arenas for a better dialogue. This new level was an attempt to strengthen the local voice in Swedish wildlife management, but the format have so far not had the mandate nor the integrity to function as deliberative arenas for Swedish wildlife management. Instead, it has become an institution with little or low political legitimacy more reproducing the conflicts between various strategic interests.

Concluding comment

This symposium provided an arena for sharing some of the results from the FORMAS funded research project *Confronting challenges to political legitimacy of the natural resource management regulatory regime in Sweden—the case of illegal hunting in Sweden* with practitioners from public agencies and ENGOs across Scandinavia. Further, it offered an arena for applying practical experiences of practitioners with scientifically produced knowledge in a discussion about the implications and drivers of illegal hunting.

The purpose was not to justify, rationalize or forgive illegal hunting or other illegal actions, but to get a better understanding of the drivers behind its occurrence. With this, the symposium sought better ability to take the right precautionary actions to minimize illegal hunting in the future and its indirect political and biological consequences, discussed above. The symposium did not come up with ‘the’ solution on illegal hunting but recognized the political drivers and the importance of applying new political measures to deal with this problem. Via the discussions at the symposium the participants elaborated on the phenomenon and by sharing their particular experiences they developed an even more nuanced picture of the complexity of illegal hunting at the popular landscape in which it is situated, rationalized or condemned.

A general conclusion from the symposium was that the consequences of illegal hunting have negative, rather than relieving, impact on the hunting community, on wildlife management and on society in general including national and international governmental institutions, whether it is tacitly tolerated or strictly deterred. Another conclusion from the symposium was that illegal hunting driven by sociopolitical drivers must now be met with democratic responses and include governmental institutional levels from EU to more local institutions, as well as the public on national and local level. How to strengthen the democratic dimension of wildlife management seems to be one of the big future challenges for public agencies, NGO’s and the research community to explore.

References

- Archer, J. (1999). Poaching gangs and violence: The urban-rural divide in nineteenth-century Lancashire. *British Journal of Criminology*, 39 (1): 25-38.
- Blevins, K. & Edwards, T. (2009). Wildlife Crime. In Miller, J. (Ed.). *21st Century Criminology: A Reference Handbook*, Sage Publications.
- Boitani, L. (2000). Action plan for the conservation of the wolves (*Canis lupus*) in Europe. In *Nature and environment*. Rome, Italy: Convention on the conservation of wildlife and natural habitats.
- Boonstra, W.J., Birnbaum, S. & Björkvik, E. (2016). The quality of compliance: Investigating fishers' responses towards regulation and authorities. *Fish and Fisheries*, 18 (4): 682-697.
- Browne-Nuñez, C., Treves, A., MacFarland, D., Voyles, Z. & Turng, C. (2015). Tolerance of wolves in Wisconsin: A mixed-methods examination of policy effects on attitudes and behavioral inclinations. *Biological Conservation*, 189: 59-71.
- Chapron, G. & Treves, A. (2016). Blood does not buy goodwill: Allowing culling increases poaching of a large carnivore. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences*, 283: 20152939.
- Comaroff, J.L. (2001). Colonialism, Culture, and the Law: A Foreword. *Law & Social Inquiry*, 26 (2): 305-314.
- Eliason, S. (2013). Policing the Poachers in the United States: A Qualitative Analysis of Game Wardens and Profiling. *International Journal of Criminal Justice Sciences*, 8 (2): 235-247.
- Eliason, S.L. (1999). The illegal taking of wildlife: Toward a theoretical understanding of poaching. *Human Dimensions of Wildlife*, 4 (2): 27-39.
- Epstein, Y. & Darpö, J. (2013). The Wild Has No Words : Environmental NGOs Empowered to Speak for Protected Species as Swedish Courts Apply EU and International Environmental Law. *European Environmental & Planning Law*, 10 (3): 250-261.
- Fairhead, J., Leach, M. & Scoones, I. (2012). Green Grabbing: A new appropriation of nature? *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 39 (2): 237-261.
- Gezelius, S.S. & Hauck, M. (2011). Toward a Theory of Compliance in State-Regulated Livelihoods: A Comparative Study of Compliance Motivations in Developed and Developing World Fisheries. *Law & Society Review*, 45 (2): 435-470.

- Givá, N. (2016). *Parks with People? Action Research in Bridging Conservation and Livelihoods in Limpopo National Park, Mozambique*, Diss. Uppsala: Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences.
- Hagstedt, J. & Korsell, L. (2012). Unlawful Hunting of Large Carnivores in Sweden. In Ellefsen, R., Sollund, R. & Larsen, G. (Eds.). *Eco-global Crimes: Contemporary Problems and Future Challenges*, Ashgate, pp. 209–231.
- Hansen, H.P., von Essen, E. & Sriskandarajah, N. (2016). Citizens, Values and Experts: Stakeholders and the Inveigling Factor of Participatory Democracy. In Hansen, H.P., Nielsen, B.S., Sriskandarajah, N. & Gunnarsson, E. (Eds.). *Commons, Sustainability, Democratization: Action Research and the Basic Renewal of Society*, Routledge, pp. 125–150.
- Hiedanpää, J., Pellikka, J. & Ojalampi, S. (2016). Meet the parents: Normative emotions in Finnish wolf politics. *Trace: Finnish Journal for Human-Animal Studies*, 2: 4–27.
- Holmberg, S. & Weibull, L. (2011). Förtroendekurvorna pekar uppåt. In Holmberg, S. & Weibull, L. (Eds.). *Lycksalighetens ö*, Gothenburg, pp. 45–64.
- Jans, J.H. & Marseille, A.T. (2010). The Role of NGOs in Environmental Litigation against Public Authorities: Some Observations on Judicial Review and Access to Court in the Netherlands. *Journal of Environmental Law*, 22 (3): 373–390.
- Kaltenborn, B.P., Andersen, O. & Linnell, J.D.C. (2013). Is hunting large carnivores different from hunting ungulates? Some judgments made by Norwegian hunters. *Journal for Nature Conservation*, 21 (5): 326–333.
- Kelemen, R.D. & Sibbitt, E.C. (2004). The Globalization of American Law. *International Organization*, 58 (01): 103–136.
- Krange, O. & Skogen, K. (2007). Reflexive tradition: Young working–class hunters between wolves and modernity. *Young*, 15 (3): 215–233.
- Krange, O. & Skogen, K. (2011). When the lads go hunting: The ‘Hammertown mechanism’ and the conflict over wolves in Norway. *Ethnography*, 12 (4): 466–489.
- Magnussen, A.-M. & Banasiak, A. (2013). Juridification: Disrupting the Relationship between Law and Politics? *European Law Journal*, 19 (3): 325–339.
- Mannarini, T., Roccato, M. & Russo, S. (2015). The false consensus effect: A trigger of radicalization in locally unwanted land uses conflicts? *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 42: 76–81.
- Manning, R. (1993). *Hunters and Poachers: A Social and Cultural History of Unlawful Hunting in England 1485–1640*. Oxford University Press.
- Massé, F. & Lunstrum, E. (2016). Accumulation by securitization: Commercial poaching, neoliberal conservation, and the creation of new wildlife frontiers. *Geoforum*, 69: 227–237.
- Musgrave, R., Parker, S. & Wolok, M. (1993). The Status of Poaching in the United States: Are We Protecting Our Wildlife? *Natural Resources*, 33: 977–1014.
- Nurse, A. (2016a). Beyond the property debate: Animal welfare as a public good. *Contemporary Justice Review*, 19 (2): 174–187.

- Nurse, A. (2016b). Criminalising the right to hunt: European law perspectives on anti-hunting legislation. *Crime, Law and Social Change*, 67: 383-399.
- Ojalampi, S. & Blomley, N. (2015). Dancing with wolves: Making legal territory in a more-than-human world. *Geoforum*, 62: 51-60.
- Okiihiro, N.R. (1997). *Mounties, Moose, and Moonshine: The Patterns and Context of Outport Crime*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Peltola, T. & Heikkilä, J. (2015). Responseability in wolf-dog conflicts. *European Journal of Wildlife Research*, 61 (5): 711-721.
- Peterson, M.N., von Essen, E., Hansen, H.P. & Peterson, T.R. (2016). Illegal fishing and hunting as resistance to neoliberal colonialism. *Crime, Law and Social Change*, 67 (4): 401-413.
- Pohja-Mykrä, M. (2017) Community power over conservation regimes: Techniques for neutralizing the illegal killing of large carnivores in Finland. *Crime, Law and Social Change*, 67 (4): 439-460.
- Pohja-Mykrä, M. (2016c). Illegal Hunting as Rural Defiance. In Donnermeyer, J. (Ed.). *The Routledge International Handbook of Rural Criminology*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, pp. 329-337.
- Pohja-Mykrä, M. & Kurki, S. (2014). Strong community support for illegal killing challenges wolf management. *European Journal of Wildlife Research*, 60 (5): 759-770.
- Raine, A.F., Gauci, M., & Barbara, N. (2016). Illegal bird hunting in the Maltese Islands: An international perspective. *Oryx*, 50 (4): 597-605.
- Råd, D.D. (2010). *Udtalelse om jagt*. Copenhagen: Department of Justice.
- Sherman, L.W. (1993). Defiance, Deterrence, and Irrelevance: A Theory of the Criminal Sanction. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 30 (4): 445-473.
- Theodorakea, I.T. & von Essen, E. (2016). Who let the wolves out? Narratives, rumors and social representations of the wolf in Greece. *Environmental Sociology*, 2 (1): 29-40.
- Thompson, E.P. (1975). *Whigs and Hunters: The Origin of the Black Act*, Breviary Stuff Publications.
- Wall, T. & McClanahan, B. (2015). Weaponizing conservation in the 'heart of darkness': The war on poachers and the neocolonial hunt. In Brisman, A., White, R. & South, N. (Eds.). *Environmental Crime and Social Conflict Contemporary and Emerging Issues*, Ashgate.
- Vitali, C. (2014). A frame-analytical perspective on conflict between people and an expanding wolf *Canis lupus* population in central Italy. *Oryx*, 48 (04): 575-583.
- von Essen, E. (2016a). Environmental Disobedience and The Dialogic Dimensions of Dissent. *Democratization*, 2: 305-324.
- von Essen, E. (2016b). *In the Gap Between Legality and Legitimacy: Illegal Hunting in Sweden as a Crime of Dissent*, Diss. Uppsala: Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences.
- von Essen, E. & Allen, M.P. (2015). Reconsidering Illegal Hunting as a Crime of Dissent: Implication for Justice and Deliberative Uptake, *Criminal Law & Philosophy*, 11 (2): 213-228.

- von Essen, E. & Allen, M.P. (2016). A Rabble in the Zoopolis? Considering Responsibilities for Wildlife Hybrids. *Journal of Social Philosophy*, 47 (2): 171-187.
- von Essen, E. & Allen, M.P. (2017). From Obstructionism to Communication: Local, National and Transnational Dimensions of Contestations on the Swedish Wolf Cull Controversy. *Environmental Communication*, 11 (5): 654-666.
- von Essen, E. & Hansen, H.P. (2015). How Stakeholder Co-management Reproduces Conservation Conflicts: Revealing Rationality Problems in Swedish Wolf Conservation. *Conservation & Society*, 13 (4): 332-344.
- von Essen, E. & Hansen, H.P. (2016). Policing Peers Between Law And Morality: A Socio-Legal Perspective On Managing Misconduct In Hunting. *International Journal of Rural Criminology*, 1 (4).
- von Essen, E., Hansen, H.P., Nordström Källström, H., Peterson, M.N. & Peterson, T.R. (2014). Deconstructing the Poaching Phenomenon: A Review of Typologies for Understanding Illegal Hunting. *British Journal of Criminology*, 54 (4): 632-651.
- von Essen, E., Hansen, H.P., Nordström Källström, H., Peterson, M.N. & Peterson, T.R. (2015). Toward a critical and interdisciplinary understanding of illegal hunting: A synthesis of research workshop findings. *Urban and Rural reports 2015:1*, Uppsala: Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences.

Appendix I

Programme

Day 1 November 30

- 09:00–10:00 Arrival at Bergendal – with morning coffee
- 10:00–10:15 Welcome
- 10:15–11:00 Presentation of programme and project background
Hans Peter Hansen, Project Leader, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences
- 11:15–12:00 *Interview findings on illegal hunting – understanding illegal hunting as political resistance*
Erica von Essen, Postdoctoral Researcher, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences
- 12:00–13:00 Lunch
- 13:00–13:20 *Illegal hunting as sociopolitical resistance in an international perspective*
M Nils Peterson, Associate Professor, North Carolina State University
- 13:20–13:30 Reflections from plenary
- 13:30–13:50 *The De-humanization and the Weaponisation of Anti-Poaching Measures*
Erica von Essen, Postdoctoral Researcher, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences
- 13:50–14:00 Reflections from plenary
- 14:00–14:20 *Illegal Hunting as a Challenge to Natural Resource Management: Contested Legitimacy and Resistance*
Olve Krange, Researcher, Norwegian Institute for Nature Research
- 14:20–14:30 Reflections from plenary
- 14:30–14:50 *Policing Perspective on Illegal Hunting*
Paul Larsson, Professor, Norwegian Police University College
- 14:50–15:00 Reflections from plenary
- 15:00–15:30 Coffee
- 15:30–17:00 Group Discussions: *Illegal Hunting as a Crime of Dissent*
- 17:00–17:30 Plenary Discussion: *Illegal Hunting as a Challenge to Natural Resource Management—Contested Legitimacy and Resistance*
- 19:00– Dinner

Day 2 December 1

08:00–08:30	<i>Whose Resources?</i> Tarla R. Peterson, Professor, University of Texas at El Paso
08:30–08:50	<i>Introduction to Survey Swedish Hunters' Attitudes toward Illegal Hunting Survey on Hunting, Wildlife and Ethics</i> Helena Nordström Källström, Researcher, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences
08:50–09:30	<i>Results from national survey on 'Hunting, wildlife and ethic</i> M Nils Peterson, Associate Professor, North Carolina State University
09:30–09:45	Reflections from plenary
09:45–10:15	Coffee
10:15–11:00	<i>Ways Toward Legitimate Wildlife Management—how to mitigate illegal hunting</i> Hans Peter Hansen, Project Leader, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences
11:00–12:30	Group Discussions: <i>Implications for wildlife management policy and research—concrete needs and suggestions</i>
12:30–13:30	Lunch
13:30–14:30	<i>Presentation of concrete needs and suggestions</i>
14:30–15:00	Closing: <i>Future Steps</i>
15:00–	Coffee

Participants

NAME	ORGANISATION
Anders Wetterin	Federation of Swedish Farmers
Angus McHattie	Scottish Crofters Federation
Anna Danell	Predator and wildlife officer, Norrbotten County Administrative Board
Anna Krusic	Digital Communicator, Forest, Nature Conservation and Mines, Swedish Society for Nature Conservation
Björn Forsberg	Head of Unit, Dalarna County Administrative Board
Caroline Lundmark	Officer for Wildlife, Örebro County Administrative Board
Christer B. Jarlås	Environmental District Attorney, Östersund
Christer Pettersson	Swedish Environmental Protection Agency
Christian Gamborg	University of Copenhagen
Erica von Essen	Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences
Erkki Turtinen	Game and Fisheries Manager, Administration of Forests (Finland)
Espen Farstad	Head of Information, Norwegian Association of Hunters and Anglers
Gunnar Glöersen	Game Management Adviser, Swedish Hunting Association

Göran Toss	President of Swedish Society for Nature Conservation in Östergötland
Hanna Ek	Swedish Environmental Protection Agency
Hans Peter Hansen	Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences
Helena Nordström Källström	Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences
Henrik Tågmark	Vice President and Predator Responsible, National Hunters' Association
Hove Sørensen	Danish Hunting Association
Jan Eriksen	President of Game Management Council, Denmark
Jens Gustafsson	National Game Management Adviser, National Hunters' Association
Johan Svalby	FACE - Federation of Associations for Hunting and Conservation of the EU.
Jonas Bergman	Head of Wildlife Unit, Dalarna County Administrative Board
Klas Allander	Swedish Environmental Protection Agency
Lars Bendik Austmo	Head of Predator and wildlife Unit, Environment Agency, National Nature Supervision
Lars Lundman	Police, Norrbotten County
Mads Flinterup	Danish Hunting Association
Mari K Pohja-Mykrä	Ruralia Institute, University of Helsinki, Finland
Markus Aho	Game and Fisheries Warden, Administration of Forests (Finland)
M Nils Peterson	North Carolina State University
Ole Mattis Lien	County secretary, Norwegian Association of Hunters and Anglers
Olle Olsson	"Svensk jakt", magazine
Olve Krange	Norwegian Institute for Nature Research
Paul Larsson	Norwegian Police University College, Norway
Pauline Palmcrantz	Swedish Transhumance Association
Peter Sunde	Aarhus University
Rebecca Nordenstam	Environmental Attorney, Swedish Society for Nature Conservation
Roar Lundby	Hunting Advisor, Norwegian Association of Hunters and Anglers
Roland Saitzkoff	Norrbotten County Administrative Board
Sara Sundin	Gävleborg County Administrative Board
Sofia Ageheim	Gävleborg County Administrative Board
Sofia Efraimsson	Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences
Solveig Larsson	National Hunters' Association
Tarla R. Peterson	University of Texas at El Paso

PREVIOUSLY PUBLISHED AT THE DEPARTMENT

Urban and Rural reports (2015-)

- 2016:1 Att lära ut akademiskt skrivande – en handledning med exempel på övningar
Eriksson, C.
eISBN: 978-91-85735-38-9
- 2015:1 Toward a critical and interdisciplinary understanding of illegal hunting – a synthesis of
research workshop findings
von Essen, E., Hansen, H. P., Nordström Källström, H., Peterson, N. & Peterson, T. R.
ISBN: 978-91-85735-36-5, eISBN: 978-91-85735-37-2

Reports - Department of Urban and Rural Development (2007-2014) ISSN: 1654-0565

- 3/2014 Nature interpretation. Sandberg, E.
Besökarnas tankar. Meningsskapande i naturum förstått genom listning av besökarnas
tankar. En metodstudie
ISSN: 1654-0565, ISBN: 978-91-85735-34-1, eISBN: 978-91-85735-35-8
- 2/2014 Landscape architecture. Dovlén, S. & Olsson, E.
Nationella, regionala och kommunala aktörer om implementering av den europeiska
landskapskonventionen i Sverige. Planering och förvaltning av landskap
ISSN: 1654-0565, eISBN: 978-91-85735-33-4
- 1/2014 Rural development. Eksvärd, K., Lönngrén, G., Cuadra, M., Francis, C., Johansson, B.,
Namanji, S., Rydberg, T., Ssekyewa, C., Gissén, C. & Salomonsson, L.
Agroecology in practice. Walking the talk
ISSN: 1654-0565, ISBN: 978-91-85735-31-0, eISBN: 978-91-85735-32-7
- 2/2013 Environmental communication. Bergeå, H., Hallgren, L., Westberg, L. & Ångman, E.
Dialogprocessen om allemansrätten Underlag för utveckling av dialogmetodik och
dialogkompetens
ISSN: 1654-0565, ISBN: 978-91-85735-30-3
- 1/2013 Landscape architecture. Berglund, U., Nord, J., Eriksson, M., Antonson, H., Butler, A.,
Haaland, C., Hammarlund, K., Hedfors, P., Thiirmann Thomsen, R. & Åkerskog, A.
Landskapsanalys för transportinfrastruktur - en kunskaps- och metodredovisning
för utveckling av väg- och järnvägsprojekt i enlighet med den europeiska
landskapskonventionen
ISSN: 1654-0565, ISBN: 978-91-85735-29-7
- 5/2012 Nature interpretation. Arnell, A. (red.)
Besökarnas röster. Utvärdering av naturvägledning, Besökarstudier, Reviewing
ISSN: 1654-0565, ISBN: 978-91-85735-28-0
- 4/2012 Rural development. Eriksson, C. & Wangenfors, T.
Fäbodbrukare om fäbodbrukets framtid. Beskrivningar av driftens villkor och synpunkter
på landsbygdsprogrammet från Sveriges fäbodbrukare
ISSN: 1654-0565, ISBN: 978-91-85735-27-3

- 3/2012 Nature interpretation. Caselunghe, E.
Forskningsperspektiv på naturvägledning
ISSN: 1654-0565, ISBN: 978-91-85735-26-6
- 2/2012 Landscape architecture. Eklund, K. J. (red.)
Parken på Grönsö. Om bevarande och utveckling av en historisk park
ISSN: 1654-0565, ISBN: 978-91-85735-25-9
- 1/2012 Rural development. Bartholdson, Ö., Beckman, M., Engström, L., Jacobson, K.,
Marquardt, K. & Salomonsson, L.
Does paying pay off? Paying for ecosystem services and exploring alternative
possibilities
ISSN: 1654-0565, ISBN: 978-91-85735-24-2
- 3/2011 Landscape architecture. Berglund, U., Eriksson, M. & Ullberg, M.
Här går man. Gångtrafikanterers erfarenheter av gåendemiljön i tre städer
ISSN: 1654-0565, ISBN: 978-91-85735-23-5
- 2/2011 Landscape architecture. Msangi, D.
Land Acquisition for Urban Expansion: Process and Impacts on Livelihoods of Peri
Urban Households, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania
ISSN: 1654-0565, ISBN: 978-91-85735-22-8
- 1/2011 Landscape architecture. Berglund, U., Eriksson, M., Nord, J., Butler, A., Antonson, H.,
Hammarlund, K., Hedfors, P. & Åkerskog, A.
Om landskap och landskapsanalys för väg och järnväg - ett kunskapsunderlag med
fokus på begrepp och exempel
ISSN: 1654-0565, ISBN: 978-91-85735-21-1
- 2/2010 Swedish EIA Centre. Asplund, E., Hilding-Rydevik, T., Håkansson, M. & Skantze, A.
Vårt uppdrag är utveckling - hållbar utveckling och regional tillväxt
ISSN: 1654-0565, ISBN: 978-91-85735-20-4
- 1/2010 Landscape architecture. Berglund, U. & Nordin, K.
Barnkartor i GIS- ett verktyg för barns inflytande
ISSN: 1654-0565, ISBN: 978-91-85735-19-8
- 7/2009 Swedish EIA Centre. Kågström, M.
Hur ska man hantera det här med hälsa? En kunskapsöversikt om hälsans roll i
konsekvensbeskrivning och transportplanering
ISSN: 1654-0565, ISBN: 978-91-85735-04-4
- 6/2009 Swedish EIA Centre. Åkesson, G., Calengo, A. & Tanner, C.
It's not a question of doing or not doing it - it's a question of how to do it. Study on
Community Land Rights in Niassa Province, Mozambique (English version)
ISSN: 1654-0565, ISBN: 978-91-85735-04-4
- 5/2009 Nature interpretation. Arnell, A., Jansson, S., Sandberg, E. & Sonnvik, P.
Naturvägledning i Sverige - en översikt
ISSN: 1654-0565, ISBN: 978-91-85735-16-7
- 4/2009 Sida's Helpdesk for Environmental Assessment, Swedish EIA Centre. Engström, L.
Liquid Biofuels - Opportunities and Challenges in Developing Countries
ISSN: 1654-0565, ISBN: 978-91-85735-15-0
- 3/2009 Landscape architecture. Hedfors, P. (ed.)
Urban naturmark i landskapet en syntes genom landskapsarkitektur.
Festskrift till Clas Florgård
ISSN: 1654-0565, ISBN: 978-91-85735-14-3

- 2/2009 Environmental communication. Andersson, Y., Setterwall A. & Westberg, L.
Miljökommunikation för miljöinspektörer
ISSN: 1654-0565, ISBN: 978-91-85735-13-6
- 1/2009 Landscape architecture. Berglund, U., Nordin, K. & Eriksson, M.
Barnkartor i GIS och trafiksäkerhet. Ett forskningsprojekt i samarbete med
Örbyhus skola
ISSN: 1654-0565, ISBN: 978-91-85735-12-9
- 7/2008 Swedish EIA Centre. Sandström, U. G. & Hedlund, A.
Behovsbedömning av detaljplaner
ISSN: 1654-0565, ISBN: 978-91-85735-11-2
- 6/2008 Rural development. Emanuelsson, M., Johansson, E. & Ekman, A-K.
Peripheral Communities, Crisis, Continuity and Long-term Survival
ISSN: 1654-0565, ISBN: 978-91-85735-04-4
- 5/2008 Landscape architecture. Norrman, S. & Lagerström, T.
Grönsö park och trädgårdar
ISSN: 1654-0565, ISBN: 978-91-85735-06-8
- 4/2008 Swedish EIA Centre. Hedlund, A. & Johansson, V.
Miljökonsekvensbeskrivning. Aktörernas roller och betydelse
ISSN: 1654-0565, ISBN: 978-91-85735-10-5
- 3/2008 Rural development. Palmer, S., Nilsson, A. & Roigart, A.
Dynamic Change in Rice Production Systems in the Mekong Delta. A students field
report from An Gian
ISSN: 1654-0565, ISBN: 978-91-85735-09-9
- 2/2008 Landscape architecture. Florgård, C.
Översyn av landskapsarkitektprogrammet SLU, Uppsala
ISSN: 1654-0565, ISBN: 978-91-85735-08-2
- 1/2008 Swedish EIA Centre. Lindblom, U. & Rodéhn, J.
MKB-tillämpningen i Sverige. Antalet MKB för verksamheter och åtgärder
2005 och 2006
ISSN: 1654-0565, ISBN: 978-91-85735-07-5
- 5/2007 Swedish EIA Centre. Lerman, P. & Hedlund, A.
Miljöbedömning och andra konsekvensanalyser i vattenplanering
ISSN: 1654-0565, ISBN: 978-91-85735-04-4
- 4/2007 Swedish EIA Centre. Sandström, U. G. Svensk översättning.
Biologisk mångfald i miljökonsekvensbeskrivningar och strategiska miljöbedömningar.
Bakgrundsdokument till konventionen om biologisk mångfald, beslut VIII/28:
Frivilliga riktlinjer om konsekvensbedömning innefattande biologisk mångfald
ISSN: 1654-0565, ISBN: 978-91-85735-03-7
- 3/2007 Swedish EIA Centre. Wärnbäck, A.
Cumulative Effects in Swedish Impact Assessment Practice
ISSN: 1654-0565, ISBN: 978-91-85735-02-0
- 2/2007 Landscape architecture. Myhr, U.
Miljövärdering av utemiljöer. Metodbeskrivning för EcoEffect Ute
ISSN: 1654-0565, ISBN: 978-91-85735-01-3

1/2007 Rural development. Helmfrid, H.
Natarsyn. Tre svar på vad natur är
ISSN: 1654-0565, ISBN: 978-91-85735-00-6

Rising levels of discontent among rural residents and parts of the hunting community toward large carnivore conservation policy has effected a phenomenon of socio-politically motivated illegal killing of these unpopular species. Such wildlife crime formed the investigation of an interdisciplinary and internationally collaborative research project headed by the Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences in Ultuna, Uppsala. Through 3 years of in-depth interview studies with hunters in Sweden, a quantitative survey to hunters, comparative studies in other parts of the world and close collaboration with Fennoscandian researchers and practitioners, this project ran to completion at the end of 2016.

The following report marks the dissemination and discussion of the research results and insights for future research produced by this project. Hence, it represents the first time the full research project and its members stand before the public and interest groups. The report synthesizes two days of workshop thematic discussions between 45 participants from societal sectors including hunting and nature conservation NGOs, county administrative boards, Environmental Protection Agencies, law enforcement, environmental attorneys and farming associations as they feature across the Fennoscandian countries: Sweden, Norway, Denmark and Finland. Its discussions center on social control in wildlife crime, the juridification of hunting issues, the influence of the EU and platforms for going forward to mitigate poaching, in particular of large carnivores like the wolf.

The report is an essential read for both researchers and practitioners faced with the problem of socially accepted, but secretive and hidden, forms of illegal hunting in response to governmental legitimacy crises, distrust of policy and policy-makers, and as a manifestation of rural resistance in modernity.