

September 29, 2007

Statement by Valerius Geist pertaining to the death of Kenton Carnegie.

I have reviewed in some detail the material pertaining to the death of Kenton Carnegie, as well as reviewed the historical material pertaining to wolf attacks on humans¹.

FINDINGS

My first finding is that in early winter 2005 at Point North Landing there was evidence for circumstances facilitating an attack on humans by wolves, followed by the predicted, pre-attack behavior by wolves. That is, the events leading to the death of Kenton Carnegie follow the pattern predicting attacks on humans as described for wolves and earlier for coyotes². It is a pattern of (a) increasing habituation followed by (b) boldness, followed by (c) closing in and testing humans prior to the (d) fatal attack. Both species explore alternative prey in much the same manner. Unfortunately, nobody present recognized the growing danger³.

CIRCUMSTANCES LEADING TO WOLF ATTACKS ON PEOPLE

Wolves are protected from hunting.

This protection removes an important *safety valve*. It prevents wolves from being readily stalked and pursued. (1) Yet stalking and pursuit condition wolves from habituating to humans, keeping them shy and away from people. (2) Secondly, the only wolves, which are likely to become vulnerable are individuals rejected by the pack, or

¹ As described in my appended report *When do wolves become dangerous to humans?*

² Baker, R. O. and R. M. Timm 1998. Management of conflict between urban coyotes and humans in southern California. Pp. 229-312 in R. O. Baker and A. c. Crabb eds. *Proc. 18th Vertebrate Pest Conference*, University of California, Davis).

³ The advocacy in favor of the “benign wolf” hypothesis is so powerful, that the better educated the persons, the more likely it seems that they are to become true believers and endanger themselves. So far exceptionally well-educated people have become victims of lethal attacks. Kenton Carnegie is not the only victim of the “harmless wolf hypothesis”. So was 24-year-old Wildlife Biologist, Trisha Wyman, who was killed on April 18th 1996 by a captive wolf pack in Ontario. I had a long phone conversation with Dr. Erich Klinghammer of Wolf Park. He was called in as an expert witness to examine the Wyman case, and discovered quickly that there was great surprise at her death, as wolves are not supposed to attack people. He was stunned at the ignorance. Ms Wyman had visited the park previously and spent some time studying the wolves. She was given the dream job of looking after and interpreting the wolves. She lasted three days! She and the people surrounding here, just like Kenton and the people surrounding him, were imbued by the myth of the “harmless wolves” as advocated by North American wolf specialists in the late 50’s and 60’s that rose to become a dogma – and a lethal one. Keepers of wolf packs can inform themselves by turning to the people running Wolf Park. These have been researching wolves for decades and have detailed advice on how to handle captive wolves and wolf-dog hybrids. They would have been quickly disabused of any naïve faith in conventional, but mis-presented science about wolves.

disadvantaged by age (too young & too old) and condition (emaciation, injury, and damaged teeth). These are the wolves, which are most likely to seek out human presence in search of food and to attack people⁴.

Scarcity of natural prey.

1. Wolves enjoyed a long protection from hunting in Saskatchewan and increased in numbers⁵. We also expect the wolves to begin losing their fear of humans, as well as deplete wildlife, their prey.
2. Long before Kenton's death, attacks by wolves on livestock in Saskatchewan had developed into a general problem⁶. That suggests a scarcity of natural prey.
3. Was there evidence for the scarcity of natural prey? *The Saskatoon Star Phoenix* of November 14th 2005 mentioned that local residents complained about the decline in game. There may be validity in the claims of residents. Scarcity of prey will force wolves into closer proximity of humans, which is not difficult for un-hunted wolves.

Garbage dump, rich food source, frequented by wolves.

Did wolves exploit the opportunity of obtaining food from a man-made source?

They did so for weeks on end (protected by the no-hunting regulations).

They came to a garbage dump and adjusted their arrival with that of the garbage carrying front-end loader. The wolves tore into plastic garbage bags beside the front-end loader. Consequently, wolves were increasingly used to human presence and human smells that they associated with food. Human scent was thus no longer a source of fear, but of expectation of food!

Wolves move about freely in daylight and were observed by personnel.

Did wolves become visible in daylight hours?

They did!

⁴ In the recent (July 5th 2007) Anderson Island attack in British Columbia, a 31 year old, fit outdoorsman was put into hospital by a 55 lb emaciated, starving old female wolf with damaged dentition. Despite him stabbing her nine times with a knife with a 4-inch blade, the wolf was not killed, but did withdraw. She was shot hours later with a shotgun. This was an unprovoked attack by a non-rabid wolf. By: Larry Pynn, *Vancouver Sun*, August 1, 2007 [Port Moody kayaker fights off a starving predatory wolf](#).

⁵ CBC News Mon. 28 Dec. 1998 23:22:26 EST *Wolves Rebound in Saskatchewan*. Reese Beaulieu estimates wolves increased about 25% in 10 years.

⁶ CBC News Mon 22 March 2000 12:00:00 AM *Wolves causing problems for farmers*. Farmers plagued by wolves need special permits to deal with the predators. "Delegates at the recent meeting of the Association of Rural Municipalities voted in favor of a resolution calling on the provinces to allow a hunting season for wolves.

That means that they were thoroughly habituated to human activities and had little, if any fear left.

Did they grow increasingly tolerant of human presence? That is, did they overcome their enormous shyness and become increasingly tolerant of humans close by?

They did!

Wolves make a first exploratory attack on humans

Did the wolves become bold, approached and growl, bark, howl or snap at persons? Were attacking wolves beaten back with sticks?

They were!

The detailed account of the Nov. 4th 2005 encounter between Todd Svarchopf and Chris van Gelder and two wolves leaves no doubt in my mind that they faced an *exploratory* attack, (which the two men were very fortunate to survive). **Photos.** It is significant that these photos were taken at the end of the encounter, after the wolves had been discouraged from further advances. They show Todd Svarchopf as photographed by Chris van Gelder. I have examined four photographic images, showing (1) a dark gray mottled wolf, broadside, fairly close to the photographer. The wolf's eyes are averted. (2) The gray wolf confronting a man with a club-like black spruce snag in hand who is facing the wolf. The wolf is in threat mode with canine exposed, upper lip raised in a snarl, corners of the mouth slightly opened and ears pitched forward. This is the facial expression of an assertive, confident wolf. It's an aggression stance. The wolf is in slight crouch, the hind legs well braced for a lunge forward. This is not the face or stance of an insecure wolf *threatening* defensively, but the stance of a confident, assertive wolf. This picture supports the statement by Todd that the wolves were aggressive. The light gray second wolf is moving into a support position towards the rear of the first wolf. (3) This picture shows two wolves in fully confident *eye-aversion* posture close to the photographer. There is not a hint of fear or insecurity in their body postures! Quite the contrary! The light gray wolf has a low level aggressive face, as revealed by the slightly open mouth, exposing the black gums, the high level of his head and the ears placed forward. Wolves assume such postures readily in the vicinity of prey⁷. (4) The *eye-aversion posture* is guaranteed to fool humans who possess the face-to-face primate signal structure. Wolves like all large carnivores use body postures to signal in social situations. *Eye aversion* is done by confident, domineering individuals. The tail position where visible is neutral-to confident. These pictures were taken at the end of an encounter leaving the wolves in a confident position. These wolves thus displayed no fear of humans⁸.

⁷ Wolves standing or even resting about a moose at bay, harassing such at a distance, are shown in Fig. 89 c&d on p. 123 pf David Mech 1966. *The Wolves of Isle Royal*. Fauna of the National Parks of the United States Fauna Series No. 7. Washington, DC.

⁸ Here is a comment by a prominent scientist who has studied wolves in Finland: *Dear Val, I agree with you in all details concerning those four pictures. I must add that seeing people play with wild timber wolves*

The wolves at the Point North Landing thus showed a classical pattern of pre-attack behavior – which nobody at the camp - or in the Saskatchewan game department - recognized as such.

An attack on a person was imminent before November 8th 2005. An attack by a pack is lethal. Well before Kenton Carnegie went on his walk on the afternoon of November 8th, 2005, it was a classical case of a wolf attack waiting to happen!

The Vargas Island attack by two wolves on a camper is a parallel to the Point North Landing case.

In both cases wolves habituated to people, in the Vargas Island (near Tofino, Vancouver Island) case, via a campground that was frequented by kayak parties, which overnighted there, as well as by very tolerant residents living on that island. The wolves began to lose their fear of humans and began being fed by campers⁹.

In mid June 2000 the naturalist photographer Jackie Windh spent two days on the island photographing wolves. Two large wolves at once sniffed her heels, hand and licked her wrist. The two wolves became increasingly assertive, forcing Windh to throw rocks and swing a stick as the male lunged at her and finally ripped her pants. Professor Erich Klinghammer of Wolf Park, Battleground, Indiana, insists that adult wolves do not play. This behavior was thus pre-attack exploration of humans - as prey.

On Sunday the 2nd of July 2000 kayaker Scott Lavigne was attacked by wolves and injured severely. He was defended and saved by fellow campers and sent to hospital in Victoria, where his wounds were stitched together by some 50 stitches¹⁰. The wolves were shot. They were healthy two-year-olds filled with deer fawns.

The wolves habituated to humans then escalated into testing humans and then attacked a human. The victim was saved by other campers, leaving no doubt as to who did attack.

like that is absolutely like tossing live hand grenade with pin on around in a crowd. The dark wolf, showing his teeth to a person just 3-4 meters in front of him was ready to charge. After lifting his tail slightly above his back line and closing his lips, maybe also after tilting his ears even more cranially he would have attacked so fast that this man would not been able to lift his club. Those two wolves were truly habituated (February 19th 2007, Kaarlo Nygrén, Game and Fisheries Research Institute Ilomantsi Game Research Station, Haravapurontie 4, FIN82900 Ilomantsi, Telephone: +358205751504, Telefax: +358205751509). However, if the threatening wolf is seen in isolation, his facial expression and body posture also fit the threat by a defensive wolf. Here it is pertinent to understand that it is the wolves, which initiated the attack on the two men in the open, and tried to cut them off from camp. Only confident wolves, that is not “defensive” wolves would do that!

⁹ Dr. Helen Schwantje, BC wildlife veterinarian, informed me that there were many reports of people feeding wolves, including folks carving out chunks of dead whale and feeding such to the wolves.

¹⁰ Jim Beatty, Vargas Island wolves too used to human contact, observer says. *The Vancouver Sun*, July 5th 2000, p. A1.

Did wolves attack Kenton Carnegie?

pp. 29-30 of *National Wildlife*, February/March 2007 edition in an article entitled “Sexy Beasts”. by Paul Tolmé we read: “Wolves remain a bogeyman today, as illustrated by the death of a Canadian man in 2005. When Kenton Carnegie’s mangled corpse was discovered near a remote Saskatchewan mining camp of Points north Landing, the Royal Canadian Mounted police immediately blamed wolves. The story made headlines around the world. But when noted wolf biologist Paul Paquet of the World Wildlife Fund investigated, he recognized immediately that a black bear killed Carnegie. “*The problem was bias right from the start,*” Paquet says.

“*When I looked at the photos, I immediately saw bear tracks,*” Paquet says.”

An examination of the evidence at hand shows that Mr. Paquet was mistaken. Mr. Tolmé wrote on p. 30 that “*Debunking misinformation is key*”. I concur!

We have at hand to examine:

- (a) the accounts of four witnesses who were on the scene of Kenton’s death on November 8th 2005;
- (b) the detailed investigations on November the 8th and 9th of investigating officer RCMP constable Alphonse Noey who was accompanied by the local coroner Mrs. Rosalie Tsannie-Burseth on the 9th , and
- (c) the account of conservation officers Kelly Crayne and Mario Gaudet who examined the scene on Nov. 10th 2005.
- (d) the photographic evidence of the scene as photographed by PCMP constable Noey on November 8th and 9th and available to independent observers.

1) The first four witnesses Todd Svarchopf, Chris Van Galder, Mark Eikel and Bob Burseth, saw the scene before it was trampled by repeat visits by themselves and later visits by the RCMP and the coroner and by two game wardens. It had snowed and they saw the tracks in fresh snow. They were interviewed separately on Nov. 8th and 9th before post hoc rationalization set in, and well before aggressive questioning could confuse them.

They were unanimous in what tracks they saw. It was wolf tracks. This is a first-hand observation.

One of the first four witnesses was a long-time resident of the area, Bob Burseth, having lived there 17 years. What he saw were wolf tracks. He confirmed that upon being questioned. Had there been bear tracks he would have said so, because wolf tracks and bear tracks are so very different, that it takes no biologist to tell the differences. A northern bush resident like Burseth would be a most reliable witness here.

Both, Bob Burseth and Mark Eikel, had rifles. Both are hunters. If so, they would know what wolf tracks look like - and would have known so at a glance.

The other two, Todd and Chris had been interested in wolves, and had been some time in this northern camp. Their eyes were the first to see tracks. They identified Kenton's track and the directions he walked. They saw the other tracks and identified such as wolf- as they must have seen wolf tracks many times.

Collectively, there is little doubt in my mind that these four witnesses first on the scene identified wolf tracks correctly.

2) RCMP Constable Al Noey and coroner Mrs. R. Tsannie-Burseth

Constable Noey on the 8th November secured the site, and began an investigation, which extended into the 9th in the company of coroner Mrs. R. Tsannie-Burseth. Constable Noey left a written account as well as a map-sketch of the scene. I noticed that he was a careful, able observer, as well as a skeptical one. He questioned, for instance, Bob Burseth about his ability to identify wolf tracks. Now, if somebody tests another person's ability to identify wolf tracks, then the questioner must have a pretty good idea what wolf tracks look like. He mentions for instance, that a wolf followed in Kenton's footprints. Yes, wolves notoriously do that with prey and with humans, but also with the tracks of other wolves¹¹.

Firstly, I have no doubt Constable Noey and Rosalie Tsannie-Ruseth both identified the tracks as wolf tracks correctly. They both had the background for that, in fact an exceptionally appropriate background¹².

¹¹ This is ancient knowledge already discussed in 1719 by Friedrich von Flemming in his encyclopedic treatment of wildlife and hunting in central Europe, *Der Vollkommene Teutsche Jäger*.

¹² I received the matter below after sending out the first draft for critique.

Rosalie (coroner at the scene)

- aboriginal and her family lived a nomadic life style until she started school
- she has been a hunter and is very familiar with the outdoors and identification of animal tracks as she was raised by hunters
- her father is an Elder
- she felt the tracks and marks in the snow told the story about what happened to Kenton

Bob Burseth (Points North employee and part of search party and Rosalie's husband)

- avid hunter
- he killed the two wolves (at the dump) after Kenton's attack
- can identify prints in the snow
- shoots the bears that become a nuisance at the camp

Mark Eikel (part owner of Points North and person who discovered Kenton's body)

- owns rifles
- does hunt and can recognize animal prints
- shot the third wolf (250 - 300 yards away) after Kenton's attack
- outdoors man
- he claimed he would have seen a bear if it had been in the area

Constable Noey (RCMP officer that attended the scene)

- aboriginal and has lived further north than Points North in Saskatchewan
- knows the outdoors and has hunted

Secondly, Constable Noey's analysis of the hunt and kill pattern of the wolves resonates well with historical knowledge. (a) A wolf followed the victim approaching from behind. This has been recorded in recent wolf attacks in North America, and in the historical literature¹³. (b) The victim ran. That's likely to trigger a severe attack by a wolf¹⁴, and the tracks, as read coroner Mrs. R. Tsannie-Burseth and RCMP officer Noey, revealed that. (c) The victim fell, but stood up again and stood bleeding. In attacks by black bears it is not common for victims to rise, as bears are good at wrestling and holding down prey. They are also heavy in body, especially fat fall bears. A bear would not have stood by seeing a victim bleed. Wolves do that! (d) The victim's body was moved a short distance. I expect black bears, disturbed on their kill to move off with the victim's body a long ways and hide it. (e) Instead the carnivores in question quickly consumed the victim's innards and meat. That's wolf behavior. Quick feeding right after making a kill is an expected behavior of wolves¹⁵. Wolves ingest large amounts of meat at once when available. This would lead to large amounts of the body of the victim being consumed on the 8th. (f) Historically, wolves on a kill are expected to stay close to the kill, and show reluctance to leave even defend the kill against armed men. It came close to that! Constable Noey on approaching the victim saw two wolves before him. He had to fire a shotgun twice before they left. That suggests rather brazen behavior on the part of wolves, consistent with observations of wolves ready to defend their kill.

Therefore, not only did Constable Noey identify wolf tracks outright, saw two wolves close to the kill on the 8th and chased such away, but his analysis of events in every instance suggest actions by wolves. He only identified the tracks of wolves and humans.

Collectively, there is little doubt in my mind that these two exceptionally qualified witnesses correctly identified wolves as the species killing and consuming Kenton Carnegie, but also correctly read the process of events as evidenced by the track and sign patterns in the snow.

3) Conservation Officers Kelly Crayne and Mario Gaudet

They stated in their report: *“Officers investigated the site and found numerous wolf tracks in the area. No other large animal tracks could be found.”*

- able to identify certain animal prints, but was intimidated by someone into admitting that he was not an expert

Ed Castle (Points North employee and part of search party)

- also part of the recovery team when the RCMP and coroner attended the scene
 - is a hunter and used to operate a Hunting & Fishing lodge in Saskatchewan
 - also identified wolf prints

¹³ Again, Flemming 1719 makes this very point, stating that a victim so approached and attacked cannot defend itself.

¹⁴ See point 3 in *Wolf Park Guidelines for keeping wolves and wolf-hybrids*. This means that a person, especially a child who tripped and fell, or who is moaning, crying, or screaming, may be considered wounded prey and attacked. Grave injuries, even death, are all too frequent in such cases.

¹⁵ See p. 52. of Henryk Okarma 1997. *Der Wolf*, Parey Verlag, Berlin.

I expect conservation officers to know the difference between wolf tracks and bear tracks!

There is little doubt in my mind that these two qualified witnesses correctly identified wolves from the tracks left by these carnivores.

4) Differences between wolf and bear tracks¹⁶

- 1) Black bear tracks have on front and hind legs **five** (5) toes; wolves have **four** (4). This difference is easily seen.
- 2) Black bear front paws have a concave shape; those of wolves are straight across or slightly convex.
- 3) Black bears walk on their heels, similar to humans. Consequently, a large heel imprint characterizes the hind footprint of any bear. These hind leg tracks look a little like a naked human foot, albeit with claw marks.
- 4) Bear tracks are much larger than wolf tracks. A large wolf track fits into the boot track of an average sized man. Bear tracks are larger.
- 5) Wolves step very precisely with their hind paws into the tracks left by the front paws; the tracks are arranged like well-spaced beads on a string. There is virtually no lateral displacement of the tracks from the median. Bears have a very wide displacement.
- 6) The claws of bears are climbing tools that enter the snow further from the toe and at a steeper angle, than the claws of a wolf who serve in speedy running.
- 7) The claws of the 2nd and 3rd digits in wolves protrude well beyond those of the 1st and 4th digit (an adaptation to running). The central claws protrude much less in bears (an adaptation to climbing).

5) Other observations

Moreover, all witnesses identified *many* wolf tracks, that is the presence of a pack, that is of several individuals. (a) Bears do not travel in packs. Wolves do! (b). Historic accounts make it plain that a single strong man can usually survive the attack of one wolf, but not of a pack. A pack of two confident wolves, such as photographed by Chris and Todd would have no difficulty with a single person. Wolves have larger jaws and teeth than dogs of comparable size and a much more powerful bite. It would not take many successful bites to disable a man. It was Dr. Paquets research that revealed that wolves can take down black and even grizzly bears. A human is no contest!

The victim had been attacked in the open, killed in the open and partially consumed in the open. That points to wolves. Wolves moved the body of the victim after the second

¹⁶ A good reference is Ernest Thompson Seton 1958 *Animal Tracks and Hunter Signs*. Macmillan of Canada, Toronto. An excellent description of bear tracks is given pp 186-189 in William H. Wright 1909 *The Grizzly Bear*. Univ. of Nebraska Press, Lincoln as well as pp. 185-193 in Stephen Herrero 1985 *Bear Attacks*, Winchester Press. Picataway, New York.

visit by camp personnel. Again, that is consistent with observations of wolves moving a kill if disturbed. (Black bears tend to carry off and skillfully hide their kills. Besides, their tracks are unmistakable).

6) Photographic evidence

I have examined the photos taken by Constable Noey on the 8th and 9th at he kill site. I have the following commentary:

- 1) All animal tracks I was able to decipher in the photos were those of a large canid, that is, of wolves. (There were also the prints of boots and one fox track).
- 2) There were paw prints of wolves right in the shoe print of Kenton.
- 3) There were multiple tracks and, since there were differences in paw sizes, there was clearly more than one predatory individual. This observation also points to wolf. European wolf specialists examining these very photos confirmed this¹⁷.
- 4) On the body, the photography revealed clean cuts, and slices cut somewhat at right angle to the bones (PICT926). That is consistent with carnassials cutting the tissue. Black bears are expected to pluck with incisors. Their molars are bunodont and dull and have crushing not cutting functions. Slicing and clean cuts with distinct, continuous edges is thus consistent with wolves feeding on the carcass. See arm in PICT927; arm and chest in PICT 934. See clean-cut skin edge in bite on lower left leg PICT933.
- 5) Note, there is no evidence in the pictures that the skin had been peeled back. The clothing had been pulled and torn, uncovering the body, apparently while the body was dragged by the wolves sometime after the second visit by camp personnel. (Paul Paquet is quoted in the National Wildlife article p. 30 “*The clothes and skin been stripped away, indicating the so-called banana-peel eating technique common to bears*”). Here Paul Paquet miss-observed.
- 6) The best diagnostic sign identifying wolves as opposed to bears is the evidence for piercing or bruising by the premolars. Wolves have sharp premolars, black bear lack such, except for some having vestigial stump as a 3rd premolar. One can clearly identify on Kenton’s shin the punctures left by the two canines and their supporting third incisors (PICT932). Unfortunately the circular nature of the shin precluded a solid grip by the premolars. There is a faint bruise on the skin where

¹⁷Dr. Eirik Granqvist, Borgå the 24:th march 2007, writes as follows:” *The pictures are for me quite clear and there is no problem to tell which are the tracks. I cannot see any footprints of a bear. Just human footprints and plenty of nice and very clear wolf-footprints. Also a fox has been interested to come and have a look*”. Dr. Kaarlo Nygrén, writes:”*Dear Val, This is what I saw in the pictures you sent me through Magnus Hagelstam: PICT0989: human and wolf tracks, struggle, blood. Snow has been fallen some days earlier, blown away from the dwarf shrubs and melted some when in contact with dark objects. Ideal conditions for tracking. PICT0985: Path with human and wolf tracks. Beside it some tracks of a man, signs of struggle, blood. Snow as in previous picture. PICT0986: Human and wolf tracks, blood, struggle. Snow as in previous pictures. PICT0987: Human and wolf tracks, struggle. 1 mid-size -to large wolf tracks coming towards the scene, 4 wolf tracks going out of it: one large, two mid-size, one small. Another track of a small canid (possibly also wolf) going to the left. No clear blood. Snow as in previous pictures. I failed to see anything resembling bear tracks in any of the pictures.* Yours, Kaarlo Nygrén, Game and Fisheries Research Institute, Ilomantsi Game Research Station, Haravapurontie 4, FIN82900 Ilomantsi, Telephone: +358205751504; Telefax: +358205751509

- the first right premolar of the wolf is expected to be (behind the canine, a bit farther back than the 3rd incisor puncture is ahead of the canine puncture, and a little further inward, laterally compared to the 3rd incisor puncture). However, as the photos now stand, the bruise is faint. The opportunity to examine such definitively was missed on autopsy. That is unfortunate.
- 7) Food consumption by wolves varies, but a very hungry wolf will consume 12 kg or more of meat at a feeding. Wolves are specialized biologically to consume a very large amount of meat at one sitting. The wolves had about 3 hours in which to feed on the victim's body before Constable Noey photographed it. From the amount of tissue missing it appears that at least three and possibly four wolves had fully fed on the body. That is some 35 to 40 kg of body mass was missing. A black bear is unlikely to have consumed that much body tissue in the short time available.
- 8) Another unfounded claim. I quote from National Wildlife: "*Carnegie's heart and liver - "the most desirable morsel for wolves" Paquet says - were left intact*". However, there is evidence to the contrary: on p. 48 of Will Grave's book on the Russian experience with wolves a Russian scientist reports that wolves, in feeding on a freshly killed moose, the heart, lungs and liver had not been touched. Dr. Kaarlo Nygren made similar findings.¹⁸ My own observations on limited number of carcasses fed on by wolves suggest that they prefer the fattest tissues and consume such first. And that is consistent with the pictorial evidence in this case.

I conclude that the evidence from the photos is consistent with the conclusion that wolves were on the site and fed on the victim's body.

Claims that black bears were involved in the incident are unfounded.

Who killed Kenton Joel Carnegie?

¹⁸ in an e-mail of March 28, 2007 Dr. Nygren wrote to me: "*They (the wolf pack) ate one ear and tip of the tongue when waiting for their turn in the abdominal cavity. The fore-stomachs were left largely untouched until almost all the good stuff was taken from the intestines. So did the liver, heart and lungs. They were taken out almost ten hours later when all the pups and their mother were lying flat around the place with their stomachs full. Then, almost in the midnight, the male came in starting to rip the carcass in pieces. A bite and a kilogram or two. He ate as much as he pleased, then pulled out the liver, ate some of it and dropped. Soon, he started to walk towards the sleepy pups who immediately jumped up and hurried to meet him with cheerful faces, tails wagging and showing submissive gestures. They looked funny with their round bellies and saw-buck like appearance. A roundish white spot cranially from their thighs on the belly coat had appeared and was visible even in the dim light of autumn. This seems to be a good visual sign of a well-fed wolf. When they poked the father's lips with their noses, he threw up everything what was in his stomach. The pups immediately ate up it. and returned to their beds. The male walked back to work, filled his stomach and did the feeding procedure several times. He seemed to have a pet among the pups. It was the smallest, a female always chased out first by the mother and siblings. The female never fed the pups like the father. In the next morning, the flesh of the prey was practically stripped off with bare bones protruding and some legs completely cut off the carcass. So, the fat reserves seemed to be the preferred bits, not the liver, heart and lungs. We have seen the same many times in the field. Guts first. Even the dogs are usually first opened from the belly and the abdominal cavity emptied. I have seen many dogs cut in two around the diaphragm, caudal halve eaten completely or transported somewhere. Heart and lungs are, in many case, were left inside the breast cavity*".

I was asked to examine available materials in order to answer above question. I have been privy to the confidential preliminary coroner's report and cannot comment on such. However, I became aware prior to reading it that there had been attempts to blame the victim, pressure witnesses and to blame black bears for the tragedy. It appeared to be an attempt to maintain the politically correct "benign wolf" conception. It is important that the hearing into Kenton Joel Carnegie's death be aware of this lest it fall victim to political correctness based on flawed scholarship. In reviewing earlier the historical material pertaining to wolf attacks on humans I discovered some very striking ironies, the most striking being that while North American wolf biologists vehemently opposed the wolf image portrayed in Grimm's' fairy tale *Little Red Riding Hood*, and failed to research and develop an understanding of when wolves became dangerous to people and when not, their colleagues studying coyotes did just that! Biologists studying urban coyotes developed a sound understanding predicting when coyotes living in cities would attack children. The biologists studying coyotes were not in a state of political denial. And they put nobody at risk. Quite the contrary! As I have shown, wolves signal impending attacks on people a long time before it happens. They act very much like their smaller cousin, the coyote. Yet the vehemence with which the myth of the "benign wolf" is defended by environmental groups, but also individuals claiming to be scientists studying wolves, transcends reason. Already a renowned biologist studying wolves laments that extremists have hijacked the wolf agenda. As scholars we must live by Oliver Cromwell's admonition:" *I beseech thee in the bowls of Christ, consider that thee may be mistaken!*" Especially, when political correctness has raised its ugly head!

As to Kenton Joel Carnegie's tragic death I harbor no doubts. He was killed and consumed by wolves.

Sincerely,

Valerius Geist, PhD., Professional Biologist
Professor Emeritus of Environmental Science
The University of Calgary