



1. Area about 6 ha or more, separated from forest by a treeless strip up to 50 m wide, within 2 km from the settlement; forests adjoining the fields are wanted by people picking mushrooms, logging wood, etc.

In each specific case, the degree of protectiveness of a site in the bear habitat (feeding area in this example) depends also on a number of other factors, but more research and clarification of the animal habitats and behaviour is needed.



## **FROM WILDERNESS TO URBAN FRINGES: HUMAN-CARNIVORE COHABITATION AS A CHALLENGE TO WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT**

**T. Peltola<sup>1</sup>, J. Heikkilä<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup> *Finnish Environment Institute, P.O Box 111, 80101 Joensuu, Finland*

<sup>2</sup> *Finnish Environment Institute, Lentiirantie 342 B, 88900 Kuhmo, Finland*

Dangerous but endangered, large carnivores are embodiments of two competing philosophies of nature, as has been pointed out by Henry Buller. One is based on biosecurity as a physical safety issue and the other on concerns of securing the conditions for life on earth (biodiversity). The contradiction between the two ideas has become a source of continuous debate on the legitimacy of carnivore policy in many countries. Drawing from an empirical case study from Finland this paper explores the intertwining of human and animal lives in ways that challenge the frames of governing animal lives. In Finland, the risks of bear attacks have been local, and incidents with animals have led to severe injuries or death only in few cases. However, as international experience shows, the risk pattern develops along the habituation of animals.

Unwanted human-animal encounters have increased along the growing bear population but importantly also due to changing patterns of human activities: expanding free-time residence and recreational use of wilderness



areas. Diminishing areas with minimum human influence force bears to step into urban fringes and second-home districts. This has made them "unnatural" companions; symbols of wilderness turning to garbage-eaters which, in the back yards of summer houses, are considered to be in the wrong place. Moving away from their "natural" environments, bears not only disturb human activities but challenge existing frames of governance. Bear population has traditionally been managed through measures targeted at animals: hunting quotas and removal of individuals with risky behavioral patterns. These measures do not necessarily help to solve the problems in urban environments: 1) shooting animals in densely populated areas is not acceptable or suitable and 2) the problems are equally caused by humans. By refusing to be governable by old means, "urban" bears alter the political landscape: focus is shifted from animal to human behavior, and different administrative bodies are forced to co-operate.



## HUNTING AND GAME MANAGEMENT LEGISLATION IN REPUBLIC OF KARELIA

**E.I. Ruppiev**

*The State Committee of the Republic of Karelia for Protection and Use of  
Objects of Fauna and Water Biological Resources, Petrozavodsk ,Russia*

We discuss state-of-the-art in legislation on fauna protection and management in the Russian Federation and Republic of Karelia, problems involved in its implementation, as well as the main tasks of the Republic of Karelia State Committee for Protection and Use of Objects of the Fauna and Aquatic Biological Resources as the authority for conservation and management of the fauna in Karelia.

