

---

Theses and Dissertations

---

Spring 2015

## The hunt for Ma'iingan: Ojibwe ecological knowledge and wolf hunting in the Great Lakes

Katherine Anne Usik  
*University of Iowa*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.uiowa.edu/etd>



Part of the [Religion Commons](#)

Copyright 2015 Katherine Anne Usik

This thesis is available at Iowa Research Online: <https://ir.uiowa.edu/etd/1781>

---

### Recommended Citation

Usik, Katherine Anne. "The hunt for Ma'iingan: Ojibwe ecological knowledge and wolf hunting in the Great Lakes." MA (Master of Arts) thesis, University of Iowa, 2015.

<https://doi.org/10.17077/etd.hxfiyzqg>

---

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.uiowa.edu/etd>



Part of the [Religion Commons](#)

THE HUNT FOR MA'IINGAN: OJIBWE ECOLOGICAL KNOWLEDGE AND  
WOLF HUNTING IN THE GREAT LAKES

by

Katherine Anne Usik

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the Master of Arts  
degree in Religious Studies in the  
Graduate College of  
The University of Iowa

May 2015

Thesis Supervisor: Michelene E. Pesantubbee

Copyright by  
KATHERINE ANNE USIK  
2015  
All Rights Reserved

Graduate College  
The University of Iowa  
Iowa City, Iowa

CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL

---

MASTER'S THESIS

---

This is to certify that the Master's thesis of

Katherine Anne Usik

has been approved by the Examining Committee for  
the thesis requirement for the Master of Arts degree  
in Religious Studies at the May 2015 graduation.

Thesis Committee:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Michelene E. Pesantubee, Thesis Supervisor

\_\_\_\_\_  
Kristy Nabhan-Warren

\_\_\_\_\_  
Phillip H. Round

To the wolves of the Great Lakes. May Ma'iingan continue to live as always.

The imminent and expected destruction of the life cycle of ecology can be prevented by a radical shift in outlook from our present naïve conception of this world as a testing ground of abstract morality to a more mature view of the universe as a comprehensive matrix of life forms... Who will find peace with the lands? The future of humankind lies waiting for those who will come to understand their lives and take up their responsibilities to all living things. Who will listen to the trees, the animals and birds, the voices of the land?

Vine Deloria Jr.,  
*God is Red: A Native View of Religion*

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

I would like to thank the continued support of my advisor Michelene Pesantubbee and my thesis committee, Kristy Nabhan-Warren and Phillip Round. This work would not have been possible without their guidance. I would also like to thank Inés Talamantez of UC Santa Barbara for her encouragement and inspiration in my field of study. Lastly, I would like to thank my family for their continual encouragement and support of my goals, without which none of this work would have been possible.

## ABSTRACT

With the removal of the Gray Wolf (*Canis lupus*) from the United States Endangered Species List in 2012 throughout most of the contiguous United States, several states legalized wolf hunting as part of wildlife management programs and the protection of livestock. However, the legalization of wolf hunting has created much conflict between indigenous and non-indigenous populations in the Great Lakes region. Many Anishinaabeg, or Ojibwe, in the states of Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan object to the state-sanctioned wolf hunting because of their long-standing religious and ecological relationship to wolves as relatives. In the Anishinaabe creation story, the Creator Gitchi Manitou sent Ma'iingan, or Wolf, as a brother and companion to the original human, where the lives of Anishinaabe peoples and wolves would forever become intertwined.

While the wolf hunting conflict appears to be one between religion and the broader secular state, it is a complex issue, involving historical religious conceptions of land and power among Anishinaabe and non-indigenous Americans. Power and traditional ecological knowledge in Anishinaabe culture originates from non-human sources, where humans must establish relationships with other-than-human beings to survive and achieve *bimaadiziwin*, or “the good life.” In a *bimaadiziwin* framework, wolves are a source of power, knowledge, and well-being for humans, suggesting that they and other non-human beings are valid models of potential ways in which humans may develop ecological models and environmental relations. A methodology based on indigenous environmental theory and non-human power may provide a broader and more inclusive framework for environmental conflicts, incorporating the roles of all the beings

that are indigenous in a certain area. In my thesis, I will show how the wolf-hunting conflict in the Great Lakes region is an example of clashing hierarchical and non-hierarchical systems of relations and knowledge, and explore how an Anishinaabe wolf-based epistemology and ontology is a valid non-hierarchical ecological model for the Great Lakes region and beyond.

## PUBLIC ABSTRACT

With the removal of the Gray Wolf (*Canis lupus*) from the United States Endangered Species List in 2012 throughout most of the contiguous United States, several states legalized wolf hunting as part of wildlife management programs and the protection of livestock. However, the legalization of wolf hunting has created much conflict between indigenous and non-indigenous populations in the Great Lakes region. Many Anishinaabeg, or Ojibwe, in the states of Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan object to the state-sanctioned wolf hunting because of their long-standing religious and ecological relationship to wolves as relatives. In the Anishinaabe creation story, the Creator Gitchi Manitou sent Ma'iingan, or Wolf, as a brother and companion to the original human, where the lives of Anishinaabe peoples and wolves would forever become intertwined.

The wolf hunting conflict is a complex issue, involving historical religious conceptions of land and power among Anishinaabe and non-indigenous Americans. Power and traditional ecological knowledge in Anishinaabe culture originates from non-human sources, where humans must establish relationships with other-than-human beings to survive and achieve *bimaadiziwin*, or “the good life.” Wolves are just one of the beings humans may establish relations with to achieve *bimaadiziwin*, suggesting that they and other non-human beings are valid models of potential ways in which humans may develop ecological models and environmental relations. With impending global climate change and ecological crises, I will explore how an Anishinaabe wolf-based way of knowing and being is a valid approach to ecology in the Great Lakes region and beyond.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION .....	1
CHAPTER 1: MA'IINGAN .....	9
CHAPTER 2: THE CONFLICT .....	32
CHAPTER 3: WOLVEN TRADITIONAL KNOWLEDGE .....	60
CONCLUSION.....	84
BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	93

## INTRODUCTION

After the United States officially delisted the gray wolf (*Canis lupus*) from the protection of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in January 2012<sup>1</sup>, several states eagerly began to draft and implement sanctioned wolf harvests. The states of Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan have already implemented annual wolf hunts, closely monitored by the Department of Natural Resources and encouraged by many ranchers concerned with the effects of the growing wolf populations on their livestock. However, wolf hunting in the western Great Lakes is not without controversy: it has attracted the attention of popular media as cultural attitudes towards wolves clash. Anishinaabe peoples, or Ojibwe, object to wolf harvesting because of their view of the wolf as a relative, a guardian of their culture, and as a teacher according to large bodies of traditional narratives. In an interview conducted by *Minnesota Public Radio* with Mary Favorite, an elder of the White Earth Band, she exclaimed "I thought, 'Oh my God'... "It's like they want to come in here and they want to shoot my brothers and my sisters" (Robertson 2013). In a similar response, Robert DesJarlait, member of the University of Minnesota Council of Elders, states "If you take the fur of ma'iingan, you take the flesh off my back" (Nienaber 2012). Environmentalists have also voiced their displeasure with sanctioned wolf harvests, arguing that gray wolves are a necessary component of the environment, and that they do not statistically pose a huge threat to livestock. However, Anishinaabe and environmentalist objections have not had much effect on preventing

---

<sup>1</sup> The Gray Wolf was reclassified as endangered in 1978 throughout most of the contiguous United States with the enactment of the Endangered Species Act, with the exception of the state of Minnesota, where its status was classified to "threatened." See the U.S. government species profile at <http://ecos.fws.gov/speciesProfile/profile/speciesProfile?spcode=A00D> for more details.

state wolf harvests. The conflict is quite nuanced, with Anishinaabe, non-Native governments, hunters, ranchers, and environmentalist groups all framing the conflict.

This thesis focuses on the Great Lakes region primarily because the greatest concentration of wolves in the contiguous United States lies within the northern forested regions of Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan, known as the North Woods. Classified as a boreal transition zone, the North Woods contain flora and fauna species from both the boreal forest in the north and the temperate forests of the south. The western Great Lakes ecoregion is part of the greater Laurentian Mixed Forest province, which is the boreal transition zone that stretches north from the Kenora district in Ontario, then south to central Wisconsin, and finally east through southern Quebec. While wolves were once very common throughout the North Woods and most of North America in pre-contact times, white settlers deliberately eliminated many wolves, with the result being that by the time the ESA was created in 1973, approximately 750 wolves remained in Minnesota, another 6 wolves lived in Michigan, and a pack made Wisconsin home (Minnesota Wolf Management Plan 2001 15-16).

According to Anishinaabe peoples, the lives of wolves and humans are intertwined. Wolves feature prominently in many of their stories, and there is also a minor Wolf Clan—thus making the wolf a relative to many Anishinaabeg<sup>2</sup>. The Ojibwe are one of several Anishinaabe groups in the region, and they include a wide range of related peoples, including Potawatomi of lower Michigan and Wisconsin; the Odawa around Lake Huron; the Algonquin of southern Quebec; the Saulteaux of western

---

<sup>2</sup> “Anishinaabe” is singular, whereas “Anishinaabeg” is plural. In the Anishinaabe language, the suffix –eg or –ag is often added to a word to make a plural; thus, for example, the plural of “ma’iingan” becomes “ma’iinganag.”

Ontario, Saskatchewan, and British Columbia; the Mississauga of southern Ontario; the Nipissing of Lake Nipissing in eastern Ontario, and the Oji-Cree, a hybrid culture consisting of both Cree and Ojibwe elements in the northern boreal forests. The vast majority of Anishinaabe land, however, called Anishinaabe-Aki (or Anishinaabewaki), lies within mixed forests, where boreal conifers and temperate deciduous trees combine to create a unique ecosystem. There, the Anishinaabe developed a rich and sophisticated body of Traditional Ecological Knowledge, or TEK, formed from interactions with the many beings and geological features of the region.

One definition of TEK is “the sum of the data and ideas acquired by a human group on its environment resulting from the group’s use and occupation of a specific region over many generations” (Alessa 246). Traditional Ecological Knowledge is a highly empirical system, where knowledge is gathered via long-term observation of natural phenomena, and is highly localized, where its incorporation into mainstream scientific inquiry is valuable in terms of both data and the inclusion of indigenous perspectives. Increasingly, more and more scholars, both indigenous and non-indigenous, have called attention to TEK as a legitimate form of empirical science on par or even sometimes superior to mainstream Western-derived science (Pierotti 10) due to its long-standing applicability in indigenous lands. TEK and indigenous environmental knowledge is sometimes proposed as an “alternative” to modern and especially western means of conceptualizing the environment; while such an approach may be potentially problematic, it has huge potential in bringing in previously marginalized indigenous theory into scholarship and ecological models, especially in terms of global ecological crises and climate change.

While the Western scientific tradition may view TEK as less valid than its own systems of knowledge, citing lack of “objectivity” and emphasis on indigenous religious systems, Western scientific epistemologies are as grounded in the traditions of European philosophies and relations to the world as indigenous epistemologies are in their respective philosophical traditions. In the former, European philosophies emphasized hierarchical thinking, where non-human animals were not considered as persons, but as resources to be controlled. In contrast, Anishinaabe TEK philosophies emphasize interdependency, with all living beings as persons. In TEK, “objectivity” is not very important, and instead emphasizes relationships and responsibilities towards the environment and its beings. To the Anishinaabeg, human systems of power and knowledge come primarily from non-human beings, who are to be learned from and emulated. Anishinaabe TEK therefore offers a non-anthropocentric model of knowledge and being, where the amount of power, knowledge, and even well-being an individual has is dependent on the quality of relationships one has outside oneself. The Anishinaabe relationship with the wolf is an excellent example of a non-anthropocentric model of environmental knowledge and religiosity because of ma’iingan’s significance in Anishinaabe culture as brother and one of their first teachers. Through the example of the wolf, I will argue that the roles of non-human beings influence the formation and maintenance of TEK even in contemporary times. Anishinaabe conceptions of wolves provides an example of a way of being that is non-hierarchical and non-Aristotelian (non-Aristotelian as deconstructing humans as the top of an interspecies hierarchy), and an Anishinaabe and wolf-based epistemology may help deconstruct any hegemonic environmental theories.

### *Chapter Outline*

My thesis is divided into three chapters, “Ma’iingan,” “The Conflict,” and “Wolven Traditional Ecological Knowledge,” complete with a conclusion. Their outlines are briefly described below.

## 1. Ma’iingan

This chapter will introduce the various Anishinaabe stories concerning wolves and the non-hierarchical and reciprocal relationship between Anishinaabeg and ma’iingan, with the teachings of ma’iingan as an important component of Anishinaabe knowledge and social protocol. Primarily, these stories emphasize the importance of the kinship between Anishinaabeg and ma’iingan, listening to elders, the role of non-humans as teachers, and the cultivation of the senses to survive in the environment. In the Anishinaabe creation story, ma’iingan is described as “intertwined” with humans, where “whatever befalls one will befall the other,” indicating that wolves and Anishinaabeg have a very close relationship, reflected in their stories. In particular, wolves are referred to as “brother” and “grandfather,” which have specific and religious meanings in Anishinaabe culture. In order to flesh out the meaning of the stories, I will further explore the meaning of “power” in Ojibwe culture, and explore kin dynamics to understand what it means for ma’iingan to be “brother” and “grandfather.” In addition, ma’iingan is understood to be one of the first teachers to the Anishinaabeg, with the implication that humans rely on knowledge given by non-human beings. To the Anishinaabeg, all animate beings participate in societies like humans do, with ma’iingan in particular a role model for clan-based living.

In chapter one, important sources detailing important Anishinaabe narratives and religious structures will include Edward Benton-Banai’s *The Mishomis Book*, Basil

Johnston's *Honour Earth Mother*, and Victor Barnouw's *Wisconsin Chippewa Myths and Tales and Their Relation to Chippewa Life*. For discussions of Anishinaabe conceptions of power, I rely on Cary Miller's *Ogimaag: Anishinaabeg Leadership*, and for roles of elders and kin I draw upon Michael McNally's *Honoring Elders: Aging, Authority, and Ojibwe Religion*.

## 2. The Conflict

This chapter will move on to the wolf hunting conflict in the Great Lakes region, both in the past and the present. I will trace the origins of the conflict, including but not limited to the history of anti-wolf sentiment in Europe, wolf bounties in North America and in the Great Lakes region, ancient religious hierarchical models of human superiority and feminization of the Earth, and Manifest Destiny. The wolf, as a symbol of “wildness” and “brutishness,” is a literal and metaphorical impediment to “progress,” and is either demonized or romanticized in popular western rhetoric.

The removal of the wolf in accordance with European populations expanding westward and northward is parallel to the colonization of North American peoples, and bears a strong resemblance to the Anishinaabe view of the wolf's destiny as “intertwined” with the Anishinaabeg. Both indigenous peoples and wolves are subject to either demonization or romanticization, or both, which ignores the personhood that both possess to create negotiations and relationships among themselves and other populations.

The chapter also discusses the conflict between secularity and religious thought within the greater wolf hunting conflict, with wolf hunting proponents claiming that Anishinaabe religious traditions cannot dictate the legality of wolf hunting—although this

opinion glosses over the religious history of land policy in Europe and its former and present colonies. To present the Anishinaabe wolf-hunting controversy as solely religion vs. secular institutions is misleading and overly binary: in fact, United States environmental policy ultimately derives from religious structures, and Anishinaabe environmental relationships are marginalized when one frames them as simply privatized religion and inapplicable to the public sphere—an example of intellectual colonialism.

For the second chapter, I draw upon the primarily the theories of Steven T. Newcomb's *Pagans in the Promised Land*, and Jon T. Coleman's historical research of interactions between European settlers and wolves in colonial North America in his book *Vicious: Wolves and Men in America*.

### 3. Wolven Traditional Knowledge

This chapter presents what an Anishinaabe- and wolf-based epistemology may look like, applying it to TEK. Since ma'iingan is considered to be the parallel brother to the Anishinaabe, it is reasonable to suggest that Anishinaabe environmental knowledge and relationships are at least in part inspired by wolf behavior. Anishinaabe TEK regards the wider environment as consisting of a network of kin relations, therefore a wolf-based environmental epistemology would stress the personal and communal relationships one has with other beings as the closest concept to “environmentalism” in traditional Anishinaabe culture. Anishinaabe TEK also integrates the concept of *bimaadiziwin*, with a properly working environment comprised of beings healthy both mentally and physically. Therefore, to maintain wolf populations in the Great Lakes is to promote well-being for not only the Anishinaabe, but also potentially for all beings. This chapter suggests that maintaining wolf populations in the Great Lakes region is ecologically

beneficial for other animals and even local ranchers, and that a wolf-based epistemology and the concept of *bimaadiziwin* are helpful in promoting sustainable ecological models.

In the third chapter, I further explore Traditional Ecological knowledge with Raymond Pierotti's *Indigenous Knowledge, Ecology, and Evolutionary Biology*, and studies of wolf behavior by various biologists such as L. David Mech, Luigi Boitani, and Jane M. Packard.

#### 4. Conclusion

This chapter addresses how the wolf-hunting conflict in the Great Lakes is an excellent example of the clash between indigenous and non-indigenous epistemologies and conceptions of land. While indigenous peoples have incorporated mainstream environmental policies, protocol, and science for their lands, the reverse process is not as common. However, if the former has proven beneficial in many aspects for indigenous peoples, why cannot indigenous TEK prove beneficial for non-indigenous legal policy and members of academia? While TEK is more well-known in contemporary times than in previous eras, TEK continues to be marginalized and colonized. While I, as a non-indigenous person, may potentially further colonize TEK by incorporating Anishinaabe conceptions of the environment in my research, it is my hope that Anishinaabe relations with wolves can be a viable example of decolonized environmental protocol.

## CHAPTER 1: MA'IINGAN

Ma'iingan as relative to the Anishinaabeg begins with part of the Anishinaabe creation story, where first humans' newness to the world prompts them to cooperate with and rely on wolves. In an excerpt from Lac Courte Oreilles Anishinaabe elder Edward Benton-Benai's *The Mishomis Book*, the narrative establishes the relationship between ma'iingan and the Anishinaabeg:

In his travels, Original Man began to notice that all the animals came in pairs and they reproduced. And yet, he was alone. He spoke to his Grandfather the Creator and asked, "Why am I alone?" "Why are there no other ones like me?" Gitchie Manito answered, "I will send someone to walk, talk and play with you." He sent Ma-en'-gun (the wolf).

With Ma-en'-gun by his side, Original Man again spoke to Gitchie Manito, "I have finished what you asked me to do. I have visited and named all the plants, animals, and places of this Earth. What would you now have me to do?" Gitchie Manito answered Original Man and Ma-en'-gun, "Each of you are to be a brother to the other. Now, both of you are to walk the Earth and visit all its places." So, Original Man and Ma-en'-gun walked the Earth and came to know all of her. In this journey they became very close to each other. They became like brothers... When they had completed the task that Gitchie Manito asked them to do, they talked with the Creator once again. The Creator said, "From this day on, you are to separate your paths. You must go your different ways. What shall happen to one of you will also happen to the other. Each of you will be feared, respected and

misunderstood by the people that will later join you on this Earth.” And so Ma-en’-gun and Original Man set off on their different journeys (7-8).

The similarities between wolves and humans are duly noted in this narrative, with ma’iingan as not only a past human relative, but also a relative who continues into the future. Other narratives not only describe wolf as a relative, but also as a teacher—roles that are intertwined within Anishinaabe culture.

To understand the significance of wolves to the Anishinaabeg requires the rejection of the idea of the atomistic self and society that older anthropologists such as Ruth Landes attributed to the Ojibwe (Landes 8), and instead adopt a contextual and relational perspective of an Anishinaabe intellectual and physical landscape. In her article “Ma’iingan Is Just A Misspelling Of The Word Wolf,” Mary Hermes describes how “ma’iingan” is not the same as “wolf”—rather, a wolf in its Anishinaabe homeland and in its original context is “ma’iingan,” whereas a wolf removed from Ojibwe land and culture is just a wolf. She quotes a non-Native administrator she calls Henry from a culturally-based Anishinaabe school in Minnesota about teaching Anishinaabe children:

We are currently teaching Ojibwe language through English thought. We say ma'iingan is equal to wolf, but it is not. [The students] think ma'iingan is just a misspelling of the word wolf... I asked [the elders], “Is a ma'iingan in a zoo a ma'iingan? They said, ‘No, it is a wolf.’” Because ma'iingan requires a context (50).

Hermes explains that in Anishinaabe discourse, events and things are relational and situational, demonstrated through the Anishinaabe language. Anishinaabemowin, the

language of the Anishinaabeg, is heavily verb- and action-based, with individual words changing based on who is doing a specific action, to whom, and as well as the specific context in which the action is carried out. Anishinaabemowin emphasizes the “process of creating and sustaining relationships” (Hermes 50-51), where every action is an event. The word “ma’iingan” then does not just mean “wolf”—it contains an entire system of relationships that are reflected in Ojibwe discourse, embedded within a cultural and environmental context. In the Great Lakes wolf hunting controversy, hunters are not only hunting wolves, they are hunting ma’iinganag. In Anishinaabe conceptions of power and relationships, the ma’iingan is a source of relational well-being. This chapter explores Anishinaabe conceptions of power, relationships, and pedagogy exemplified by traditional narratives concerning wolves, and the context of ma’iigan in Anishinaabe social structures.

### *Conceptions of Power*

In order to understand the significance of the wolf in Anishinaabe society, it is necessary to delve into Anishinaabe conceptions of power, interdependency, and relationships between humans and non-humans. Anishinaabe perceptions of “power” are difficult to contextualize within English because it is not hierarchical and nor does it imply coerciveness. Rather, power is relational and spiritual. In an Anishinaabe context, to have power means to have less dependence on the immediate environment and one’s kin network for survival and well-being (C. Miller 23). Consequently, humans possess little power in comparison to other beings without help from the *manidoog*, who are considered to have much more power and independence than more inherently dependent, inexperienced, and physiologically weaker humans (Johnston ix, 112 2003).

The word “*manidoo*” (plural “*manidoog*”) is often translated as “spirit,” although “spirit” is somewhat inaccurate and misleading. Elder Basil Johnston of the Cape Croker Reserve in Ontario describes *manidoo* as “supernatural essence” (xxi 2003), although this definition is problematic because Anishinaabe traditions do not distinguish between or reify the categories of “natural” and “supernatural.” Cary Miller describes *manidoog* as “realities other than the physical ones of rock, fire, water, air, wood, and flesh—to the unseen realities of individual beings and places and events that are beyond human understanding but are still clearly real” (7), who permeate the lives of humans.

*Manidoog* are present everywhere and all living beings have *manidoo* contained within, and their existence is reflected in the Anishinaabe language. Anishinaabemowin grammar distinguishes between “animate” and “inanimate” categories, with anything in the former category considered living persons. The “animate” category includes not only *manidoog*, plants, and animals, but also some objects considered to be “inanimate” in western cultures, such as tools or stones (C. Miller 24). The Anishinaabe environment is full of persons, in which entire species are viewed as separate cultures, with their own customs and roles much like an individual nation. While all beings are animate and have *manidoo* and therefore possess power, power is not evenly distributed among all beings. In Anishinaabe tradition, Gichi-Manidoo<sup>3</sup>, the Great Spirit and Creator figure, granted all beings different gifts and power, which they often share for the benefit of others. Most often, a being with more power will give their power as a gift to a less powerful being out of pity or compassion (C. Miller 22-24), enabling survival and/or acquisition of spiritual power and knowledge. Anishinaabe conceptions of power do not conform to Aristotelian

---

<sup>3</sup> Also spelled Gitchi Manitou, or Gitchie Manitou, among others, depending on source.

principles where humans are superior to other animals—rather, humans are the least powerful creatures in the world and incite the most pity because of their inherent dependence on *manidoog* and other beings for the continuation of human life.

In Anishinaabe oral tradition, ma'iingan is a relative and demonstrates its power as a generous provider, and teaches human survival and protocol from its compassionate pity. To be a relative in Anishinaabe culture means to engage in reciprocal and mutual obligation through generosity, with discontinued reciprocity meaning a potential loss of a relative—an undesirable prospect in an environment where the only sound method of survival is to depend on the generosity of others. In many Anishinaabe traditional narratives, non-human beings assume familial roles to humans and instruct them in learning subsistence and religious practices much like elders do with children. Animals and plants have the ability to instruct humans as well, and ma'iingan acts as elder towards humans, teaching the Anishinaabeg about survival and social protocol. Without the help of ma'iingan, humans would not have survived nor apprehended the concept of a world where there is not an atomistic self, but a relational self. It is, therefore, accurate to say that maintaining a relationship with ma'iingan is one avenue in which one becomes human, becomes Anishinaabe.

### *Narrative Teachings*

The word “Anishinaabe” is not solely a reference to a specific tribal identity or Indigenous nation—it means “human”—a collective and creative enterprise. To the Anishinaabeg, being human is a social process and a process of becoming, not a static given. It is only with time, age, and establishing relationships with others that one becomes more and more Anishinaabe, wherein one cultivates reciprocity with elders and

other respected beings. To create and maintain relationships with various beings is not only to become increasingly more human, but also to cultivate *bimaadiziwin*.

*Bimaadiziwin* is often translated as “the good life,” or “the long life,” but it is more nuanced than simply striving to have a long, pleasing life. It is a form of the verb to “move by” or “move along,” referring to all animate beings, and what one should ultimately strive for in an Anishinaabe religious context. It is to live “life in the fullest sense, life in the sense of longevity, health, and freedom of misfortune [and] this goal cannot be achieved without the effective help and cooperation of both human and other-than-human persons, as well as by one’s own personal efforts” (Hallowell 171 1964). In a *bimaadiziwin* framework, the present consists of beings who are constantly moving interdependently within the surrounding community. The word “*bimaadiziwad*” does not accurately translate to “living things,” but to “those who have power”—beings with less need and dependence, such as plants, animals, and *manidoog* (Black-Rogers 147n2).

For a human to attain *bimaadiziwin*, it means to be conscious of the many *bimaadiziwad* and know the correct and ethical manners in which one was to interact with them. It is another element of human survival that is not limited to pure subsistence. *Bimaadiziwin* is not only the natural movement of animate beings, but also a cultural way of being, an ideal way of being human and Anishinaabe (McNally 49). To be human, in other words, is to operate somewhat at an intersection of many crossroads comprised of *bimaadiziwad*. To ignore the influence of others and the *bimaadiziwad* is to lessen quality of life and well-being. Ma’iinganag are also *bimaadiziwad*, and therefore can help humans achieve *bimaadiziwin* and fulfilled lives.

Cultivating *bimaadiziwin* requires the ability to learn and trust, as well as the acquisition of proper reciprocal social behavior. Non-humans are the primary source of knowledge for humans, which includes ma'iingan. Ma'iingan teaches how one must learn that one must respect their elders and to trust their advice, and how one must engage all the senses to learn about their environment to survive. The assistance of ma'iingan in the narratives creates an Anishinaabe episteme and ontological process, where wolves have traditional ecological and social knowledge that is passed onto humans through a continual relationship. The acquisition of wolf-based knowledge is a way to *bimaadiziwin*, to a way of being.

Humans' dependence for knowledge and ways of being on wolves and other non-human beings reflected in the Anishinaabe creation story, where Gichi Manidoo created humans after all other the other beings in the world. Therefore, humans are more inexperienced than non-humans, necessitating humans to seek out the generosity of plants, animals, and *manidoog* to learn how to survive. Basil Johnston relates a story in which the Original Human finds a wolf pack to live among, and learns to trust in *bimaadiziwad* and interact with kin. The story begins with Original Human living with ma'iingan and her cubs, attempting to fall asleep on a cold winter night. At first, he did not know how to keep himself warm, so he let the wolf and her cubs sleep on top of him, covering him like a blanket. The strong odor of the wolf cubs' tails bothered him, and one night he asked for the cubs to remove them from his body. He soon grew cold and shivery, and pleaded for them to replace their tails after finally deciding that the warmth was far more important than any unfavorable odors.

However, he continued to complain about other aspects of their living situation, such as the den site. Original Human said to the wolf “It’s too small. I can hardly breathe... and besides, it’s too dark.” The wolf promised him that he could pick the next place to sleep, and the next day, he picked a maple stand for everyone to sleep in. The wolf and her cubs doubted his decision, but did not contradict him. Original Human quickly regretted his choice when he woke up to a strong blizzard during the night, and he grew so cold he feared he would not survive the night. He woke up the wolf to say that he could not live through the blizzard, and asked if they could move to a more sheltered place. She woke up her cubs, who grumbled at Original Human’s poor choice. She led them through the heavy blizzard, and they held onto each other’s tails for guidance because Original Human could not see through the blizzard at night. He did not have the advantage of a tail, so he was last in line as he clung to the tail of the cub in front of him. They eventually found a sheltered cedar bush that would protect them from the snow, and the wolves and Original Human drifted off to sleep, feeling warm.

The story continues to show Original Human’s inexperience with hunting and social protocol. While Original Human thought that they were wandering aimlessly through the forest, the wolf was busy teaching him and her cubs how to track and hunt deer in the deep snow. First Man wondered why they should not just rush at the herd of deer in the area, instead of holding their distance as ma’iingan instructed. One of the cubs could not understand why they were holding back from the hunt either, so he decided to bolt ahead and pursue a deer. The deer deftly threw him into the air with a flick of his antlers, and the cub tumbled away, yelping in pain. Original Human was surprised because he thought the cub’s speed would have been enough to kill the deer, but the

mother wolf corrected him and said to him and her cub “Never rely on speed alone. It will only earn you first injuries... You’ll survive. Don’t be so impulsive next time! Let that be a lesson to you.”

The wolf turned to Original Human to test his knowledge, and asked which of the cubs he thought would be the best hunter. Original Human always felt utterly stupid compared to the wolf, and he always answered her questions wrongly. He first pointed to a cub with a long tail, but she disagreed, saying that the tail would add too much of a burden to carry. He then selected a cub with the loudest howl, but the wolf said that it would be too noisy and frighten prey. Original Human grew embarrassed from his lack of knowledge, and the wolf finally answered the question so he could save face. The wolf pointed out a cub who did not seem extraordinary at all, because he was patient and a good listener. Original Human scoffed and said that patience would just let the pack go hungry, but the mother wolf pointed out the virtue of waiting for prey—the cub would learn to value a feast, and he would know that he could only be successful in the hunt cooperating with a pack and not alone. He would learn how to patiently stalk his prey properly to wear it down and capture it. Original Human longed for the day he no longer had to depend on wolf and her guidance because was weary of feeling inept and unknowledgeable in front of the pack, but he could not live without them until he learned about the process and dynamics of hunting for himself (Johnston 112-16 2003)

In this story, wolves are very human-like; or, perhaps more accurately, humans, are very wolf-like. In traditional narratives, it is not wolf that is an anthropomorphized projection of human culture, but is rather one of the original models for humanity. Non-humans such as wolves are considered distinct persons in Anishinaabe culture, who may

freely share their powers especially through the avenue of gifting. Anthropologist Irving Hallowell says that the “Ojibwe do not, themselves, ‘personify’ objects. For example, the sun is perceived as a person of ‘other-than-human class; it is not perceived initially as a natural object onto which ‘person’ attributes are subsequently added” (38 1964). The wolf-like nature of humans takes on another dimension when one realizes that traditional Ojibwe culture relied on constant movement and hunting for meat, very similarly to the lives of wolves (Barnouw 50). The stories suggest that humans are not considered to be superior to other animals in Ojibwe society; rather, they are deficient in many ways in comparison to other animals and non-humans must be teach them proper ways of life and being.

Ma’iingan is depicted as quite perceptive concerning social protocol, and subtly provides a listener ways in which they may or may not conduct themselves with their kin and environmental community. The methods that wolf uses to teach Original Human is precisely how elders and older relatives teach the younger generations proper social protocol. Michael D. McNally explains

Among the Ojibwe... learning is more than the acquisition of empirical knowledge about objectified things: it is a matter of learning one’s relatedness to other subjects... cultivating the knowledge and practice of relatedness is *hard work* [author’s emphasis], a lifelong matter of human discipline and culture. Such learning requires humility, economy, restraint. It requires listening, watching, and learning that markedly distinguish Anishinnabe idioms of learning (48).

Ojibwe methods of teaching involve using all the senses first, and patience. Listening attentively to elders speak is paramount, which is part of *manaajitowin*, respect (McNally

136). Teachings are expressed mostly through example, with less emphasis on words, and even teachings expressed through stories are conveyed in an indirect manner (Broker 3). The deeper meanings and messages are deciphered by the listeners, and they often convey what is or is not acceptable protocol in the community (J.R. Miller 18). Kimberley Blaeser of the White Earth Reservation in Minnesota says “Indian people don’t *teach* [author’s emphasis] their children. They *story* [author’s emphasis] them” (Vannote 5).

The wolf stories not only orient one to the Anishinaabe landscape, but also to its intellectual and epistemological landscape, where their meanings are embedded in a far larger context than the atomistic self. The wolf stories remind the listener to trust the words of elders and *bimaadiziwad*, and to remember that all actions are relational. A listener is not *taught* about ma’iingan—they are *storied* about ma’iingan. Neither can a listener take a story in isolation to determine its meaning; it must be contextualized in relation to other narratives with an underlying connection the speaker desires to convey. Swampy Cree elder Louis Bird says “In our culture you cannot specifically... extract the story from a person, just one item. No, you can’t do that. In order to have an understand [*sic*] piece or information, fully understood, you will have to listen to elder [*sic*] why he tells you the stuff. You have to listen [to] stories, a series of stories that he emphasizes this is what he’s talking about. And that way you do not extract the particular information you want from an elder [*sic*]” (McNally 40).

To rush, interrupt, or openly defy the instructions and implicit messages of elders is to show *mindawe*, a term meaning the “petulance of a child, or the impatience of a non-Native person with an undue sense of entitlement” (McNally 144). Original Human often

expresses *mindawe*, frequently defying and doubting the actions of his wolf kin. He consistently complains about his living situation with the wolves, although it is obvious he needs their guidance for warmth and food. He feels entitled to openly gripe over the mother wolf's den site, implicitly disrespecting her decisions and experience. He overestimates his own abilities, which the mother wolf does not openly chastise—rather, she lets him make a mistake, and indirectly teaches him the consequences of rushing before one is ready. All of her lessons are paramount in a hunting environment, and where the weather is often severe and unpredictable. Her ways of teaching are similar to when young Anishinaabe boys began to accompany their fathers and uncles during hunting to observe and participate so they can learn the skills needed to provide for their families. Hunting requires smooth cooperation within the party's members, and careful observation of animal habits and patience, with no room for defiance or *mindawe* unless one wants to go hungry. Young Anishinaabeg must quickly learn how to conduct themselves in a hunting party and be patient, which is one of the teachings of ma'iingan in this story.

If *mindawe* is reflected in the petulance of a child, then ma'iingan also serves as an elder figure, teaching humans to behave much like one would teach a child proper behavior. Ma'iingan is depicted both explicitly and implicitly as an elder in Anishinaabe narratives, such as the story of Wakayabide collected by Victor Barnouw at Lac Du Flambeau in 1944. The story begins with a man named Wakayabide, who brought home meat to his wife every day, but never the hearts or livers of deer. One day, his wife requested that he bring her home heart and liver to cook, and he agreed. What she did not know, however, was that he never directly hunted the deer—wolves killed them for him,

and they would eat the heart and liver while Wakayabide took the rest of the meat. He agreed to bring back heart and liver, and woke up early the next morning to find the wolves who killed his deer. He found a wolf and chased it, and as he did so, different articles of his clothing gradually fell off until all he was wearing was his belt. After the wolf had killed the deer and left with the heart and liver, Wakayabide decided to pursue him through the woods to obtain the desired organ meats, but it grew dark and he lost sight of the wolf.

It became very cold, and with little clothing and nothing to create a fire with, Wakayabide prepared to freeze to death. He found a pine log to sleep by, and the wind picked up and grew dangerously colder. He heard rustling nearby, and he thought that it was something that was going to kill him, but it was the wolf he had pursued earlier. The wolf said “Wakayabide, you were foolish to follow me. You know well that you can’t catch me when I’m running. My grandchild, why did you chase me? I’ve come back to warn you. If I hadn’t come back, you’d have frozen to death tonight. I’ve come back to tell you what to do. I want to give you my life. I want to protect you, my grandchild... Tonight, I will give you my garment, so you can sleep well.”

When Wakayabide looked up and saw the wolf, the wolf started to shake off his fur, which became a blanket. The wolf shook again to create another blanket, and Wakayabide saw that the wolf shrunk as more and more of his fur came off. After he shook off two blankets, the wolf was only about an inch tall, and curled up beside Wakayabide as he slept peacefully in the cold night. In the morning, the wolf said “Now I’ll take my blankets back, and I’ll show you how much power I’ve got.” He shook and returned to his normal size, with the blankets gone. Then he said “Anything you ask me,

I'll give you the power. Now watch close again.” He shook until he was quite small again, and told Wakayabide to sew him onto his belt, where he would protect him for the rest of his life, and offer help whenever he asked (Barnouw 142-43).

In this story, *ma'iingan* is grandfather, a common term of respect. The term “grandparent” is used not only for biological grandparents in Anishinaabe culture, but more broadly for any respected elders and for respected non-human beings such as *ma'iingan*. *Manidoog* “themselves are addressed as ‘grandparents,’ the relationship between people and the spirits framed in terms of the intimacy as well as codes of respect involved in ideal relationships between their grandchildren and their grandchildren” (McNally xii). A relative in Anishinaabe culture is not primarily determined by direct blood relations, but by social relations and roles. Just as the boundaries between human and non-human life are not rigid but quite permeable and flexible, so are the boundaries for relatives. An elder may be any respected being, human or non-human, who maintains elderly roles—suggesting that *manidoog*, wolves, and other non-humans may function like elders to humans. Since *manidoog* and animals were created before humans, sharing their greater power and knowledge may be similar to the dynamics of elder and younger in Anishinaabe society.

A title of respect for an elder is *gichi anishinaabe*, or “great human,” highlighting their importance. Elders are the primary teachers within Anishinaabe culture, especially for young children. Young children and elders often socialized together because they were unable to perform much of the hard physical labor required for camp life, and so young children received much of their education from the instruction and stories of the elders. The relationship between elder and grandchild is not an authoritarian or stern

relationship, however. Gentle teasing from both parties is common, for example, and while elders may have a type of elevated status because they have cultivated more humanness than the young, the relationship is marked by sharing. Dunning writes “although a grandfather is in some ways superior in status to his grandchild, the relationship is almost a reciprocal one” (86). An elder’s status is dependent on having had more opportunities and networks to share power than a younger person, because of their longer life. Cultivating power and therefore widening one’s network of dependency is hard work, requiring one to actively maintain these relationships with elders and incorporating their teachings. Honoring and “respecting elders in such a system is among the more important expressions of this practice of relationality... it is a characteristic of the teachings of elders that gaining knowledge and gaining facility with the proper relationality go hand in hand. On Ojibwe terms, as people mature, they stand the possibility of becoming more and more human, more and more Anishinaabe” (McNally 48).

Similarly, creating and sustaining relationships with *manidoog* and other non-human beings also makes one more human, where the inability to establish a relationship with at least one *manidoog* meant that one was not truly a full-fledged member of the community (C. Miller 29). Relationships with all beings, whether *manidoo* or human, rely on reciprocity. Although a *manidoo* or other being may share its power and knowledge to another out of pity and compassion, the gifts must be used in the correct manner and require proper ceremonial obligations. If the gifts are not used properly, then disastrous consequences could result, such as illness or complete retraction of the gift (C. Miller 32-33). Since personhood is extended to all animate beings in Anishinaabe society,

one must honor reciprocal protocol and treat animals, plants, and *manidoog* as one would treat their own relatives. Gifting and sharing would introduce a *manidoo*, plant, or animal within a human's wider kin network, and vice versa. An Anishinaabe person would often address non-humans with familial terms, such as brother, sister, as well as grandparent (C. Miller 27).

Ojibwe society was never traditionally nuclear, containing extended and fluid familial relationships that include non-human beings and humans from other endogamous groups. Anishinaabe often addressed European governors as "grandfather" or "father," for example, to include them in their kinship network. Rather than the nuclear family, the clan system is the primary way in which Anishinaabeg identify themselves. A clan is called a *doodem* in Anishinaabe society, a kinship network where one inherits a relation to a non-human being, and carries kin obligation to others of the same *doodem* (Bohaker 25-26). All members of a *doodem* are the descendants of a particular non-human progenitor, originating from creation stories known as *aadizookaanag*, meaning "grandfathers" (Bohaker 32). Members of the same *doodem* are considered to be siblings, with any sexual relationships or marriages among members of the same clan regarded as incestuous. Anishinaabe *doodem* are patrilineal, passed down from father to child, and a woman also typically lived with her husband's family when married but did not inherit her husband's clan. Young Anishinaabeg then grew up with their paternal cousins, whom they considered to be full brothers and sisters. Brothers and nephews often lived close to one another and shared the same clan, so they often hunted together.

In the stories of Nanabozho<sup>4</sup> and ma'iingan, the wolf becomes an adopted brother to the cultural figure Nanabozho and assumes the role similar to an elder clan brother teaching his younger brother the skills of hunting, as well as the importance of silence and the full use of the senses in the acquisition of knowledge. Nanabozho is a very prominent figure in Ojibwe narrative, and he features in a large body of oral traditions as one of the creators of the world. He is half *manidoo* and half human, born one of the sons of the west wind *manidoo*, E-bangishimog, and a human woman named Wiininwa. In his narratives he is rather ambiguous in nature, demonstrating his *manidoo* power as a creator, but also frequently indulging in his human weaknesses. He exemplifies the capacity of human negative traits, such as dishonesty, boastfulness, greed, pride, laziness, and disrespect. While many of his intentions in Anishinaabe narratives are positive and not negative, he is also very inexperienced in life as he blunders through obstacles as a human might who has not yet learned to establish proper relationships with kin and *manidoog* (Johnston 2 2003). Narratives of Nanabozho and the wolves are similar to Basil Johnston's story of Original Human and ma'iingan, wherein ma'iingan teaches him hunting skills but Nanabozho demonstrates disrespect and distrust of elder figures. However, these particular narratives place more emphasis on his inability to fully engage the landscape with his senses.

A story recorded by Victor Barnouw in 1944 at Lac Du Flambeau begins with Nanabozho wandering in a forest in late fall, crossing a frozen lake and seeing a pack of wolves approaching his way. He hid in some nearby bushes to conceal himself, but as the

---

<sup>4</sup> Also spelled as Nanaboozhoo, Nanabush, Wenabozho, Waynaboozhoo, Wenabojo, among many other variations, depending on source and dialect.

wolves traveled closer, he emerged from the bushes and approached them and said “Brothers, come here. I’ve walked all over, looking for you, I heard that you were around here somewhere. The last time I saw you we were babies. You wouldn’t remember me.” Nanabozho lied about having known them once before, but the wolves believed him. Nanabozho asked which wolf was the oldest, and the wolves pointed to one of their group, and said this particular wolf was their parent. So, Nanabozho called the eldest wolf his brother, and thus became uncle to the rest of the pack.

The wolves and Nanabozho traveled extensively and hunted for quite some time together, but eventually the wolves suggested that they leave Nanabozho behind so they could travel more easily. Nanabozho pleaded to stay with them, and the eldest wolf relented out of pity. Since Nanabozho could not physically keep up with the pack, the eldest wolf told him that they could both trail behind the rest of the pack and follow their tracks. Yet, the parent wolf still always remained ahead of Nanabozho as Nanabozho struggled to keep up with the speedier wolves. One day, the wolves began to chase a deer, and they scattered in different directions, leaving Nanabozho uncertain where to follow. The eldest wolf asked Nanabozho which wolf he thought would catch the deer first, and Nanabozho replied that it would be the wolf who jumped the longest distance. The old wolf disagreed, and said that it would be the wolf who jumped the closest to the deer. The two brothers argued together as they pursued the other wolves’ tracks, defending their positions, and then they came upon a tooth embedded into a tree trunk. One of the other wolves dislodged it as he bumped into the tree in pursuit of the deer. The old wolf said to Nanabozho, “Pull that arrow from the tree, and then take it to the one that’s lost it.”

Nanabozho said it was silly to carry around a dog's tooth, but the old wolf replied "I've been telling you not to talk so much." The wolf pulled out the tooth, and it became an arrow. Nanabozho carried the arrow, and they rejoined the rest of the wolves where the kill had been stripped to the bone. The eldest wolf told Nanabozho to prepare an area to process the meat, but he was confused because could not see any meat present, but he did so anyway. The old wolf instructed one of the younger wolves to give half his meat to Nanabozho, and he regurgitated some of the meat in his stomach into the preparation area in the manner that an adult wolf will do for their cubs. Then, the other young wolves did the same thing, and the oldest wolf gave Nanabozho permission to eat.

Another time the eldest wolf said it was time to make grease and tallow out of the bones they acquired from their kills. However, the old wolf instructed them all that when one is making tallow, the others cannot look at the one who is making it, otherwise the bone would slip and hit the offender in the eye. The parent wolf told Nanabozho "You're a great one for not obeying orders and for not listening to what you're told. If anybody watches or peeks at the wolf while he's making grease and tallow, the bone will slip out of his hands and come and hit that person on the eye." The wolves and Nanabozho all covered their faces with blankets, but Nanabozho grew curious about the process of making tallow and grease. He peeked through a hole in the blanket and saw the wolf gnawing vigorously on the bone to draw out the grease, but then the bone slipped and promptly hit Nanabozho in the eye. The old wolf told Nanabozho that he must have looked at the other wolf, but Nanabozho insisted "No, he came and hit me."

Sometime later, Nanabozho decided that he wanted to try and make tallow and grease out of the bones as well. He instructed the wolves to cover their faces and not look

at him, and he created a plan to get retribution for being hit in the eye previously. After chewing on the bone for a while, he went over to the wolf whose bone hit him, and promptly struck him in the eye in revenge. As the wolf yelled in pain, Nanabozho accused him of looking at him. Because of this incident, the eldest wolf grew suspicious and began to wonder if they should leave Nanabozho to avoid any potential future harm. He told him that the pack was going to leave him, but that they would let one wolf remain with him to help him. This particular wolf liked Nanabozho, and after the other wolves left, Nanabozho's wolf took care of him and hunted for him (Barnouw 30-40).

In this narrative, Nanabozho especially exposes the negative aspects of his human heritage with his humorous blunders. Nanabozho demonstrates how a human should not conduct themselves with kin and the larger environment, not having learned what *ma'iingan* teaches him. Nanabozho typically does not listen to the oldest wolf, and he argues with him about pack dynamics and hunting strategies, although the oldest wolf certainly knows far more about the subject matter. Nanabozho defies the warning about looking at the wolf making tallow bone, his poke in the eye a physical reminder to heed the warnings of elders and other beings. The wolf even directly tells Nanabozho "I've been telling you not to talk so much" in response to his doubts concerning the wolf's suggestions. Silence is essential in a hunting environment, and Nanabozho has yet to learn its value as he absorbs what *ma'iingan* and the environment teach him. Lack of silence and the failure to listen is a form of *mindawe*, disrespecting the words and knowledge of *ma'iingan* in addition to his frequent defiance and arguments with the wolf.

Nanabozho also struggles with another lesson *ma'iingan* attempts to teach him: to use all of his senses in their full capacity. In contrast to the sharp and discerning wolf,

Nanabozho fails to see objects that are useful to him because he overly relies on his vision and not his other senses. When he does not want to look into the wolf's socks for food and when he does not want to carry around the wolf's tooth, he is demonstrating a superficial understanding of appearance. In another version of the narrative collected by Barnouw, it was wolf feces on the ground that the eldest wolf instructed him to pick up, stating it was a warm blanket. Nanabozho initially refused because he did not want to handle feces, but the wolf picked it up and it turned into a tanned wolfskin, which Nanabozho gladly accepted. The tooth in the tree, the feces on the ground, and the sock all appear useless or distasteful to Nanabozho, but they are all in fact useful objects or transform into useful objects.

The over-reliance on sight to determine something's nature is particularly common in Western culture, where historical biases deem sight as the "rational" sense and smell, touch, and taste as the "lower" or "primitive" senses (Classen 402). However, in a tradition that depends on hunting and oral transmission of knowledge such as Anishinaabe society, sight cannot be the primary means of acquiring knowledge. To successfully survive, a being must also cultivate the other senses fully because one sense may not accurately discriminate something's true substance. Appearances do not always convey the true nature of a being or object in Anishinaabe tradition because physical forms are conceptualized as fluid and malleable, while the "spirit" or *manidoo* is independent of the body and considered the only true constant form of a being. Hallowell states that "the soul is the only necessary substratum" in Ojibwe culture for a functioning self," and "any particular form is incidental... Thus, various kinds of metamorphosis can be accepted so long as it is assumed a soul continues to exist" (176 1955). The ability to

transform the physical appearance is potentially available to all beings, and is a mark of possessing great power (Hallowell 177 1964). In a world full of *manidoog* and other beings that may change form, learning to discriminate visual phenomena and using senses other than vision is paramount. The wolf, leading by example, teaches Nanabozho to look for what he cannot immediately see which is especially useful in a hunting space where one must be ever-vigilant. Other than the prescribed five senses of Western cultural tradition (sight, hearing, smell, taste, touch), there is also a type of *manidoo* sense in Anishinaabe culture, where a being develops the ability to discern the “true” form of an object or being from sensing the *manidoo* quality. The development of all the senses allows Nanabozho to become a better hunter, but also a better being: by sensing *manidoo*, he may begin to create proper relationships with other beings in order to achieve *bimaadiziwin*.

### *Conclusion*

The roles of ma’ingan as elder, teacher, brother, and *bimaadiziwad* are all intertwined, with the wolf helping Anishinaabeg to create a wolf-based episteme and ontology as a means of relating to the world and becoming increasingly more human. Anishinaabe narratives of ma’ingan are excellent examples of indigenous environmental theory and application: they indicate how human culture does not flow unilaterally from itself onto other beings. Instead, human cultures are informed by non-human beings in a constant motion of interdependency. To the Anishinaabeg, a proper human is not an individual unit, but a relational “self” that ma’ingan and all other animate beings are a part. To the Anishinaabeg, ma’ingan is not just “wolf,” but a huge network of interrelated processes that is a potential source of a good life, as long as mutual

obligations and reciprocity is maintained correctly. Interactions with ma'iingan are also one of the ways in which the Anishinaabeg have become Anishinaabeg and continue to become Anishinaabeg, and ma'iingan has the capacity to teach humans to strive for *bimaadiziwin* if they trust the *bimaadiziwad* and open up their senses to them.

The concept of *bimaadiziwin* is an incredibly useful concept for approaching the current wolf-hunting controversy in the Great Lakes region because it is an Anishinaabe-centered approach to a charged issue affecting large communities in the Great Lakes region. A *bimaadiziwin* framework centers the issue back onto the land and peoples itself, and not merely as a legal issue steeped in European colonial thought. A *bimaadiziwin*-centered paradigm incorporates all beings within an environment and the epistemes they create, expanding conceptions of the natural environment from that of a collection of interrelated and empirical phenomena to that of a social environment, where environmental interrelations mutually shape and inform ways of knowing and being. From a wolf-based epistemology and ontology, a person in the Great Lakes may be able to conceive of the Great Lakes region as not only a place, but as an epistemological paradigm and a means to becoming human. Ma'iingan knowledge becomes an intrinsic component of Great Lakes region and its history, as well as the continual formation of its history. The next chapter will concern the history of both land and ma'iingan in the days after European contact, and how European religiosities and histories evolved attitudes towards wolves and shaped the cultural and physical landscapes of the Great Lakes.

## CHAPTER 2: THE CONFLICT

Europeans entering the Great Lakes region introduced paradigms from their homelands concerning land and environment, altering the region both physically and socially, including human-wolf relations. The origins of the wolf hunting conflict lay directly with the formation of anti-wolf sentiment in Europe, itself a product of complex histories and narratives of the land: narrative defined as the primary means in which a social world is created, understood, and lived. As narrative is formed from mutual interactions with the environment, narratives create and are created by the beings, thereby creating the history of a place. Narratives of the Aristotelian hierarchy, the subjugation of a feminized Earth, Christian dominionism, *terra nullius*, an aristocratic hunting culture, livelihoods based on animal husbandry, and the concept of private property all shaped Europeans' relations with the environment including wolves, and were carried over into the North American continent where they clash with Anishinaabe narrative. The symbol of the "big bad wolf" in European narrative is a narrative of "wildness," of "untameability," and an obstacle to "progress," much like European narratives of the Americas and its indigenous habitants. As history is a kind of performed narrative, western Eurasian ideologies and narratives of wolves and the land were reenacted in the Americas and created a history of colonization and wolf-hunting. Europeans would eventually impose their narratives upon North America lands amidst indigenous narratives, with the current wolf-hunting conflict as a by-product of these complex historical interactions with the environment.

The narrative of the wolf-hunting conflict in the Great Lakes region cannot begin without delving into the historical and philosophical roots of European colonization. The

Great Lakes and its beings are a confluence of narratives—which includes European narratives and Anishinaabe ideologies after contact. European and Anishinaabe narratives concerning the land and wolves were quite different at the time of contact, with the former conceiving of elements of the environment existing in a rather rigid hierarchy and the latter seeing the environment consisting of an interrelated matrix of power sharing. To the Europeans, the new landscape was to be feared, tamed, and “civilized” by European technology and ways of being—much like the wolf. European colonization of the Americas and the wolf has many parallels, with the land and its wolves subject to European narrative and history, which unfolded and was reenacted in the new landscape. To the Anishinaabeg, relationships with the land and wolf are ways of becoming human. To Europeans at the time of contact, the land and wolves did not help in the process of becoming human—rather, they inhibited it, or even reversed it. As representations of uncultivated “wildness” and incivility, the land and wolves reduced humans to “savagery” unless created in the environmental image of Europe or ultimately destroyed. The two ideologies collided in the Great Lakes region, which continue today in the wolf-hunting conflict.

### *Human Hierarchy*

The idea that wolf as an animal could reduce humans down to a state of “wildness” and “savagery” is informed by the concept of interspecies hierarchy, with non-human beings as inferior to humans. The works of the Greek philosopher Aristotle may perhaps be the earliest documentation of an expression of interspecies hierarchy. He claimed nature dictated humans as superior to other animals because of perceived capacity for reason. In his book *Politics*, he states

...tame animals are naturally better than wild ones, and it is advantageous that both should be under subjugation to man; for this is productive of their common safety: so it is naturally of the male and female; the one is superior, the other inferior; the one governs, the other is governed... for other animals have no perception of reason, but are merely guided by appetite, and indeed they vary very little in their use for each other; for the advantage that which we receive...arises from their bodily strength administering to our necessities (Ellis 1.5 1254b).

In Aristotelian principles, all beings are subject to a natural law of domination, and animals are meant to be subjugated by humans lest they become a threat to the well-being of humanity.

According to Aristotle, domesticated animals are more valued than wild animals to humans because of their usefulness to human economy. However, all animals benefit humans in some way. He expresses their usefulness in a hierarchy, as “plants are created for the sake of animals, and animals for the sake of men; the tame for our use and provision; the wild, at least for the greater part, for our provision also, or for some other advantageous purpose, such as furnishing us with clothes and the like” (Ellis 1256b 1.8). Since Aristotle understands animals to be resources only to humans, then humans are justified in hunting them. He also says:

As nature makes nothing either imperfect or in vain, it necessarily follows that *she* [my emphasis] has made these things for men, for which what we gain in war is in a certain degree a natural acquisition; for hunting is a part of it, which it is necessary for us to employ against wild beasts... on which occasion such a war is by nature just: that species of acquisition then only which is according to nature is

part of the economy... which are useful for the state as well as the family (Ellis 1256b 1.8).

Not only is hunting deemed natural and necessary, but also the Earth is conceived of as a subjugated female (“nature” as a feminized pronoun), where the “civilizing” force of man is the only way to render the land as valuable. Aristotle’s “nature” is that of a woman who exists solely to provide for men and their economies, with animals as one of her provisions for the state. Hunting wild animals is a “just war” and not just a practice of subsistence, implying that wild animals such as wolves are war prizes and captives that contribute to the well-being and political power of a state.

He also develops a dichotomy between domesticated animals and wild animals, creating an artificial distinction between “developed,” or human-constructed entities, and “undeveloped,” or non-human constructed entities, with the former as superior because of its usefulness to humans only. According to his argument, wild animals such as wolves would lie more outside of the human sphere of influence, such as domestication, and therefore are more dangerous to the well-being of humans. Wolves, as occasional predators of livestock (domesticated and therefore more under the influence of humans), would certainly fall into the “wild” and non-human sphere of influence, and become a potential threat to humanness—where only through human dominionism it becomes useful.

### *Dominionism*

Christian thought, like Aristotelian ideas, had a profound impact on the conceptions of land and non-human beings in Europe, where humans also presided above

non-humans in a religious hierarchy. These ideas, in turn, had an impact on European relations with the North American continent. The United States, and arguably all lands colonized by Europeans, exists within a paradigm constructed by the imaginations of the European diaspora: a paradigm that presumably presides *over* indigenous paradigms and relations to the land according to the ideas of Christendom. In accordance with paradigms of hierarchy, European-derived cultures may view indigenous peoples, lands, and non-human beings as “barriers and “obstacles” to industrialized progress, and thus by extension even as “backwards” (Newcomb 4).

The origins of the Christian dominionistic narrative lie with Genesis, where God establishes a divine order in the manifestation of a hierarchy in which humans hold dominion over non-humans and the land. Genesis 1:28 declares that “God blessed [Adam and Eve] and said unto them ‘Be fruitful and increase in number; fill the earth and subdue it. Rule over the fish in the sea and the birds in the sky and over every living creature that moves on the ground.’” Here, power does not originate from dependence or lack thereof as in Anishinaabe narrative, but from ability to control other beings via divine mandate. The right to possess land when it is already occupied (humans or otherwise) is also addressed in Genesis, with the story of Abraham’s covenant with God and the command to invade and conquer the indigenous peoples of Canaan as a colonial adventure story (Newcomb 39)—arguably a precursor to the invasion of the Americas. The biblical colonial saga begins when God instructs Abraham and his kin to move from Ur to Canaan, where in Genesis 12:2-3 he tells him “I will make you a great nation, and I will bless you... and all peoples on earth will be blessed through you.” While native Canaanites already inhabited the land, God nevertheless grants Abraham and his kin the

right to inhabit Canaan and possess its people (Genesis 15:17). The covenant extends not only to the land of Canaan, but also to the whole Earth, as expressed in Psalms 2:8, where God speaks to King David and says “Ask of me, and I will give you the heathen for your inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for your possession,” which is interpreted as a divine plan of globalization and conquest of non-Christian lands and its inhabitants. Wolves and other beings are to be “inherited” by the Chosen People and therefore under the possession of Christians, to be controlled and even destroyed if they do not fit the goal of conquest.

When Christians appropriated the concept of the Chosen People, they likened themselves to Abraham and his kin, and defined nations outside of Europe as the “new” Promised Lands and the beings who inhabited them became the right of the conquerors. They imaginatively constructed non-Christians lands and peoples as the new Canaan and the new Canaanites respectively, with non-human beings as resources to serve European interests. Euro-Christians, viewing themselves as the new Chosen People, “assumed themselves to possess the divine right to mentally apprehend (“discover”) and physically apprehend (seize and take possession of) all heathen or pagan lands throughout the world” (Newcomb 43), thus creating the concept of the “right of discovery.” Generally, the origins of Euro-Christian legal title to indigenous lands are traced to a series of papal bulls issued by Pope Alexander VI in the 1490’s. Most notably, the *Inter Caetera* bull, issued in 1493 after Pope Alexander VI learned of Christopher Columbus’s landing in the Caribbean, directly invokes the rhetoric of dominion in the Old Testament. In the papal bull, Pope Alexander the VI declares that

...your purpose also, as is your duty, to lead the peoples dwelling in those islands and countries to embrace the Christian religion... by the authority of Almighty God conferred upon us in blessed Peter and of the vicarship of Jesus Christ, which we hold on earth, do by tenor of these presents, should any of said islands have been found by your envoys and captains, give, grant, and assign to you and your heirs and successors, kings of Castile and Leon, forever, together with all their dominions, cities, camps, places, and villages, and all rights, jurisdictions, and appurtenances, all islands and mainlands found and to be found, discovered and to be discovered... And we make, appoint, and depute you and your said heirs and successors lords of them with full and free power, authority, and jurisdiction of every kind... (Davenport 87).

Pope Alexander VI declared “possession” of non-Christian peoples and lands as a right of Christian royal powers granted by God and the Church. He frames non-Christian lands yet unknown to Europeans as lands to be “discovered,” implying that Christian dominion is the ultimate determiner of land identity, so powerful that it must override non-Christian land ownership. If Christians assumed that they already had dominion over the Americas and other indigenous lands even before they arrived, then Euro-Christian powers not only projected the “new” areas as analogous to Canaan and the Canaanites, but also projected Christian civilization as the “perfecting” agent of all lands of the earth. Thus, the absence of Christianity indicates imperfection—rendering non-European and non-Christian lands and peoples as “imperfect,” and in need of “correction” via conquest.

The presence of wolves, as undomesticated and therefore “savage” animals, would disrupt the process of subduing, controlling, and “correcting” the land—the

process of “civilizing” it. “Civilizing” the land not only involved assimilation and the conversion of non-Christians, but also reshaping the land in the image of Europe. European colonizers compelled indigenous cultures to adopt European-style agriculture and animal husbandry, even if they had already successfully practiced agriculture before contact, such as the Anishinaabeg. Metaphors of agriculture and “up-down” imagery are common in colonial rhetoric, with control thought of as residing metaphorically upward, and subordination thought of as residing metaphorically downward, thereby leading to statements such as “The United States has control *over* wildlife.” With this metaphor, Europeans and European colonizers expressed their assumed authority to *subject* the land, wolves, and other non-humans under their “dominion,” thus creating a narrative and history of colonization. Interestingly, the word “colonization” derives from land and plant imagery, with the Latin root word “*colere*,” meaning “to till.” Therefore, cultivation provides an image of colonization, as aptly explained by Newcomb:

... colonization can be thought of in terms of the steps involved in a process of cultivation: taking control of indigenous soil, uprooting the existing indigenous plants (peoples), overturning the soil (the indigenous way of life), planting new colonial seeds (people) or transplanting colonial plants (people) from another environment, and harvesting the resulting crops (resources) or else picking the fruits (wealth) that result from the labor of cultivation (colonization). (14)

Newcomb characterizes the roots of the word “colonization” as reflecting two types of narrative structures that Newcomb calls the “Conqueror model” and the “Chosen People-Promised Land model,” both of which are characteristic of Christian dominionism. The word “Christendom” itself contains the roots “Christian” and

“dominion,” the latter derived from the Latin term *dominus*, defined as “he who has subdued” (Newcomb 23). The act of subduing includes declaring and redefining a certain area of indigenous land as now part of a European nation, to which the land is now the “right and “property.” Subduing land can only occur when the land is “settled,” “tamed,” and “domesticated”—the word “domesticated” tellingly contains the root *dominus*.

As recalled in the passages in the Old Testament, the native Canaanites had no right to their lands because God granted Abraham and his kin the area, as well as the lands of the whole world. The Canaanites only “lived in” the land, and were not recognized as “owning” their lands because God already promised the ancient Hebrews right of dominion. Similarly to the descriptions of Canaanite lands in the Bible, wolves are only “occupants” of their lands and not necessarily seen as intrinsic social components of the landscape, with limited agency under the United States government which has “ultimate dominion.” Under Euro-Christian narratives, non-human beings and indigenous peoples are only temporary occupants who Euro-Christian powers will inevitably conquer, with the goal of expansion as a way to achieve full dominion.

### *Terra Nullius*

In addition to the idea of dominion, the concept of *terra nullius* is a narrative that shaped the legal and physical landscape of North America, involving a mental projection of “emptiness” onto land that many Euro-Christian powers and modern nations use to undermine indigenous sovereignty and elimination of non-human beings. If indigenous lands can be designated as “empty,” then the Euro-Christian apprehension of those lands can be legally and morally justified. The word *nullius* itself derives from the Latin term *null*, meaning “none,” or “void.” The origin of *terra nullius* in the United States likely

lies in the legal policies put forth by John Winthrop Sr. of Massachusetts Bay in 1629, when he declared “...that most land in America fell under the legal rubric *vacuum domicilium* because the Indians had not ‘subdued it’ and therefore had only a ‘natural’ and not a ‘civil’ right to it” (Jennings 82). Newcomb explains that “the category *nullus* was a means of unconsciously constructing an imaginary schema of a container that was conceived as either nearly empty or completely empty. Such an imaginary container or emptiness could also be conceptualized as a vacuum, opening, or space to be ‘filled in’ with whatever conceptual content the Christian Europeans desired, such as ‘ultimate dominion,’ ‘absolute title,’ and ‘heathen occupancy’” (104)—indicating *terra nullius* is as much a psychological and narrative “space” as a physical one. If the land is constructed as a vacuum rather than a dense interrelated matrix of life forms, wolves are but one of the persons to be eliminated for expansion and “progress.”

Similarly, in Europe, the Eurasian Gray Wolf was largely eliminated in hunting campaigns before colonization, leaving the landscape empty of threats to livestock and of “wildness” to expand cities and agricultural areas. The histories of wolves in Europe and of post-colonial North America are remarkably similar, with institutionally-backed incentives for their elimination. European wolf-hunting may then be read as a desire to maintain human dominionism, with the least amount of “wild” and therefore “savage” animals to “corrupt” human-controlled lands, made in the image of human superiority.

### *Wolves in Europe*

The history of European land relations and wolves are related, with dominionistic attitudes about land also applying to wolves as an extension of the landscape. The development of dominionistic attitudes towards wolves in European and Euro-American

cultures is a complex history, with the wolf featuring as a largely ambiguous figure in narrative. The European subspecies of Gray Wolf were once widely distributed throughout the continent, but now resides in only a fraction of its original range. It is common in Eastern Europe and the mountains of Spain, Italy, and Bavaria, but is relegated to the fringes of Scandinavia in northern Europe. The ambiguity of the wolf in European cultures is most likely due to ecology: nomadic shepherds viewed wolves the least positively because of more direct competition with wolves, and sedentary agriculturalists more positively (Boitani 3) because the latter often placed their flocks and herds into permanent shelters which nomadic shepherds often did not have (Boitani 8). It is generally accepted that southern Europeans historically had more positive attitudes towards wolves than did central and northern Europeans, perhaps because of the more mountainous geography of southern Europe, as opposed to the flatlands of the Northern European Plain. Wolves could retreat to the mountains in southern Europe and avoid human activity and livestock, whereas in the northern flatlands wolf territories could more easily overlap human territories and hunt livestock (Boitani 7).

The more negative attitudes towards wolves in northern Europe are also attributed to its negative symbolism in Germanic mythology (Boitani 6); however, representations of wolves in Germanic narratives are complex. The pre-Christian Germanic cultures who settled Britain, such as the Norse and Anglo-Saxons, had especially ambiguous views of wolves, where in narrative they had both positive and negative associations. Use of wolf skins indicates reverence for their hunting skills, which was transferable to warrior classes. In Old Norse, the *úlfhéðnar* (*úlfheð* translated as “wolf skin” or “wolf hide”) were a class of warriors, who, when preparing to go to battle, would don wolf skins and

enter a furious trance, enabling their spirit to assume the form of a wolf on the battlefield. Incidentally, the initiation into the *úlfhéðnar* required first killing a wolf (Boitani 6), creating an entrenched hunting culture that equated wolf-hunting with the courage to go to war. Another indication that the wolf was admired for apparent bravery and leadership qualities is found in naming practices: in Anglo-Saxon culture, many people, both men and women, had *-wulf* (“wolf”) in their names, such as Cynewulf, a famous Anglo-Saxon poet, and Coenwulf, an Anglo-Saxon Mercian king. Approximately 230 place names in Britain that exist today contain either the Anglo-Saxon *-wulf* or Scandinavian-derived *-ulf* (Aybes and Yalden 202, 204). Other indicators that the wolf had characteristics that were valued included some Anglo-Saxon grave sites that feature wolf claws buried with the dead<sup>5</sup>, and the depiction of the wolf in the art of the Anglo-Saxon site Sutton Hoo, which Pluskowski suggests it may represent a familial clan animal (70).

Wolves were also considered sacred to the head Germanic god Odin, with the Norse Eddas describing two wolves named Geri and Freki (“Greed” and “Hunger” respectively) who accompanied him. Wolves were sometimes associated with the magical abilities of powerful women, where in Old Norse narratives prominent female figures such as the *völva* (female magical worker) Hyndla had an accompanying spirit in the shape of a wolf, who she would ride on to do business in other spiritual worlds (Sturleson 219 1936). The giantess Hyrrokin also rode a wolf to other worlds (Sturleson 82 1966). In its most negative aspect, the Norse Eddas describe the giant wolf Fenrir as in constant pursuit of the sun, eventually devouring it and Odin when the apocalyptic event

---

<sup>5</sup> Pluskowski indicates that the claws may in fact be dog claws, because it is difficult to distinguish dog claws and wolf claws of the same size.

Ragnarök comes. Overall, the wolf in ancient Germanic culture may have represented fury, trance, and war—areas attributed to Odin. Positively, this could apply to bravery and leadership, and negatively into greed and ferocity.

Although pre-Christian Germanic cultures admired the wolf in certain ways, the negative wolf associations in Britain grew once the Anglo-Saxons became Christianized approximately around the sixth century ACE. In Christian narrative, the wolf was often a symbol of wickedness and “human rapacity and deceit, of wantonness and sexual excess, the animal ready to attack sheep, symbols of mildness and goodness.” Matthew 7:15 warns of false prophets as “wolves in sheep’s clothing,” and in Isaiah 11:6 the “wolf will live with the lamb” during the Second Coming as peace triumphs over sin (Boitani 7). The Middle Ages saw the decline of the wolf throughout Europe corresponding with the rise of Christianity, but nowhere was the extermination so quickly carried out as in Britain. Because the amount of livestock a person possessed often signified their wealth and livelihood throughout Europe, and because wolves competed with elite deer hunts, extermination campaigns and bounties were placed on wolves. They constituted a threat to Church, nobility, and livestock alike.

So threatening were wolves to the established social structures that they soon became a medium of exchange and reward. In year 937, the first King of England Æthelstan demanded tribute from the defeated Welsh King Hywel Dda in the form of 300 wolf skins a year, which continued until around 1066 with the death of the last Anglo-Saxon King Harold II. English King Edgar I granted amnesty to lawbreakers in payment of wolf heads during his reign in years 949 to 975, and successive kings accepted wolf

scalps as payments as well (Boitani 4). However, it was the Norman conquest of Britain in the eleventh century that brought dramatic upheavals for Britain and its wolves: the introduction of an aristocratic culture with exclusive hunting rights. Wolf-hunting intensified during this time, and there are more definite records and evidence for the killings than found in pre-Norman Britain<sup>6</sup> (Pluskowski 70).

The Normans, originating from the Normandy region of France, invaded Britain in the eleventh century ACE and established themselves as aristocratic rulers, changing the social and physical landscape. Forested areas known as *foresta/foresti* were set aside as aristocratic hunting grounds, where Norman nobility gained exclusive hunting rights for in the twelfth century ACE. Deer was the most prized target, with such fierce competition among nobles for venison that wolves posed as major obstacles for elite Normans, who then desired to eliminate them. While in some Anglo-Norman fables the wolf is depicted as a symbol of nobility, it is more often depicted as vermin (Pluskowski 71). Although initially the wolf could only be hunted in designated *foresti*, by the late eleventh century the Crown began to give land grants to those who promised to keep their area clear of wolves and vice versa, and by the twelfth century, knights were assigned the duty of wolf-hunting. The English kings during this time also had attendants of specialized wolf hunters to collect bounties, known as *luparii*, and by the fifteenth century, a special office of professional wolf hunters was established within the Crown (Pluskowski 72).

---

<sup>6</sup> Aleksander Pluskowski disagrees with the assumption that there were extensive wolf hunts in Britain before the Norman Conquest, citing lack of evidence before Norman records. Rather than religious reasons, he argues that the main decline of wolves was due to the Norman aristocratic activity of deer hunting. However, his position does not take into full account the religious hierarchies in Middle Age aristocracy.

Ultimately, the wolf's decline was intertwined with the lives of deer, where not only did organized wolf hunts lead to its extinction, but also the competition it faced with Norman nobility, the increasingly poor management of the *foresta* system, and the overhunting of deer as all factors contributing to the extinction of the Eurasian Gray Wolf in Britain, where its population could not be replenished from mainland Europe (Pluskowski 74). The elimination of wolves seemed not to be driven by their pelts, as their skins had relatively little commercial value in Britain and elsewhere in Europe, but from competition with a colonizing elite (Pluskowski 73). The last wolf was killed in England around the year 1500, but they remained in large numbers in Scotland due to its dense forests and remoteness. Scotland established a similar system of *foresta*, and in 1560 Scottish King James I created a law mandating all men in his kingdom to participate in a mass wolf hunt three times a year during cubbing season, and Queen Mary of Scots personally hunted wolves in the forest of Atholl in 1563. The Scottish finally exterminated them when they destroyed much of the land's dense forests, presumably cutting off their prey supply. Wolves were finally declared extinct in Scotland by year 1684 (Aybes and Yalden 24).

The French, the other major European power in the Great Lakes region, instituted policies that had the effect of eliminating the wolf more slowly than in Britain. Between the years 800 and 813, King Charlemagne created a special wolf hunting task force called "Louveterie," establishing a system where if a person killed a wolf, they had the right to demand money from any person living within two leagues of the slain wolf. Consequently, the Louveterie left unpopulated areas relatively alone, and wolves survived in these remote areas of France. The Louvetier was discarded in 1789 during the

French Revolution, but it was revived by the new government in 1814, where it paid the Louvetier to report each killed wolf. The rate of elimination accelerated with the introduction of poison as bait which eliminated thousands of wolves, with the last ones killed in 1927 (Boitani 5).

In addition to economic costs to society, wolves also threatened a rational, “civilized” society. Literature of medieval France in particular equated outlaws and criminals to “mad dogs” and “rabid wolves,” where the “animal nature within” had taken over their human rationality (Komornicka 158). Rabid wolf attacks on humans, while uncommon and greatly exaggerated in the historical record, nevertheless incited more hatred towards wolves and other large carnivores in medieval Europe (Wilson 215). Medieval Christian literature throughout Europe equated the process of acquiring rabies with being possessed, where the symptoms of hydrophobia, unmitigated aggression, and increasing inability to recognize others exemplified the shift from a rational “good” Christian to that of a demon (Komornicka 158).

The Aristotelian binary between that of the rational human and irrational animal presented a kind of dualism in medieval thought, where both natures were contained within a human and a constant battle raged within between the two, with criminality a result of the “bestial” and “savage” side of human nature uncontrolled. Conversely, salvation was rewarded to those who could keep their inner “beast” contained by rational humanity, because salvation was contingent upon the rationality of humans—non-human animals, by virtue of their irrationality, could not achieve eternal salvation (Komornicka 160). In the medieval European cultural narrative, wolf becomes a symbol of wildness,

demonic forces, and the “bestial” nature that resides within us, turning us towards sin and damnation. The wolf as an evil force is especially exemplified by European narratives such as “Little Red Riding Hood,” by the German authors Brothers Grimm, where the “big bad wolf” threatens the innocence and purity of a virginal young girl and her grandmother—the good Christian soul and the “beast within” polarized. The narrative of the evilness of the wolf carried over into North America, where European colonists sought to eliminate it in the new landscape.

### *Wolves in Colonial North America*

Almost immediately, British colonialists in North America began to exterminate wolves, where narratives of wolveren bloodthirstiness and evilness were spread throughout the colonies. New England colonists were told to beware of “ravening wolves”—false prophets, sinners, and heathens (Mather 1691). Rural colonists often told stories of wolves surrounding and killing lost travelers in the woods (Hosmer 98-142). Wolf bounties began quickly after European settlement, with killing methods ranging from gunfire, traps, dug-out pits, setting large dogs to trail them, setting them on fire, putting hooks into bait that perforated the wolves’ digestive tracts, and most strangely, capturing them and releasing them alive, only to leave them with their mouths or even penises sown shut with wire (Coleman 3).

Wolf parts became trophies and symbols of colonists’ superiority. Though their skins were nearly worthless, the wolf heads obtained from the bounties were often displayed prominently in important buildings, such as town meetinghouses. Jon T. Coleman suggests that their heads were perhaps as a means to display a “trophy” and the

might of the colonists, where they “became symbols in the colonists’ and Indians’ struggle over land and political ascendancy” (61-62). Colonists lumped Native Americans and wolves together, with both represented as having similar natures and similar symbolisms as obstacles to expansion. Native Americans were often referred to as “beasts” and “wolves”—thus linking the “savage” animal to Indigenous peoples (Coleman 32). Both wolves and natives inhabited areas unsuitable for agriculture, such as swamps and dense forests, where they often hid from colonist attacks. Colonists imagined them both as dwelling in “dark and dismal swamps,” where colonists underscored perceived connection between indigenous peoples and the “wild wickedness” of wolves. (Morton 28). Colonists justified the extermination of both wolf and indigenous peoples by likening them to one another, where indigenous peoples “act like wolves and are to be dealt withal as wolves” (Stoddard 269-70).

The threat of wolves and indigenous peoples was also linked to the concept of personal private property. The concept of personal property, and the need to expand and protect it, was another primary reason for the widespread wolf killings in colonial North America. In a capitalistic system, livestock are considered personal property, and thus have monetary value; however, because the wolf can destroy that property, it relegates them to the likes of criminals and thieves. Wolf and livestock conflicts were common in colonial North America, mostly because of free-ranging animal husbandry practices: colonists allowed their livestock to be turned loose and graze where they saw fit. The colonists changed the fencing laws of Britain, where fences did not keep livestock in—rather, the fences kept them out of their fields. This practice possibly originated from the lack of labor force in the early colonial period, and livestock were poorly supervised and

often escaped, attracting the attentions of local wolves. The practice of free-range livestock grew to become engrained in the culture of colonial life, and eventually into broader American life (Coleman 54). This was perhaps another method of colonial expansion into the indigenous landscape—free-roaming domesticated animals altered the landscape in a Biblical pastoral image, and created an easy way for colonists to claim more and more territory from American Indians.

Wolves emerged as a double threat because not only did they predate personal property, but also they inhibited the process of colonialism and human dominion. To the Euro-Christian imagination, only within the confines of a human-controlled, pastoral space could human activity thrive, and it was their duty to expand and “domesticate” the land in its image, including its beings. The juxtaposition of and association with equating the wolf as an evil force, the practice of free-ranging livestock, and the concept of personal property were all factors that led to the decline of the Gray Wolf in North America, where wolves represented the hostile outside forces of a Biblical pastoral economy, and inhibited the duty to expand God’s domain by “domesticating” the landscape. The wolf’s inherent “wildness” could only descend the land into wickedness, sin, and outside the boundaries of God’s law and order, and deny humans’ right to exercise their dominion.

#### *Wolves’ Ascendancy and Reintroduction*

In the twentieth century, however, the Gray Wolf’s reputation slowly improved. With more and more Americans leaving agricultural life behind and instead working in industrialized fields in large cities, the hatred towards the wolf slowly retreated into

irrelevancy for many city dwellers. Government-sanctioned wolf hunting still occurred, but it occurred in rural areas where there was widespread ranching and entrenched anti-wolf sentiment. Perhaps as a way to recapture a romantic image of “the Wild West” and of the frontier, some wolf hunters began to view the wolf and its impending extinction in a light ranging from sympathetic to overly sentimental. Aldo Leopold was one of the first published authors to have a favorable view of the wolf, born from a hunting trip when he was younger. In his 1944 essay entitled “Thinking Like a Mountain,” he documents how he once shot a female wolf, only to be overcome by sadness as he approached her and saw “a fierce green fire dying in her eyes” (138-139). After this incident, he became a passionate conservationist, inspiring other would-be conservationists and later, the modern environmentalist movement.

The stories of Stanley Paul Young and Ernest Thompson Seton overly sentimentalized the wolf, depicting them as brave, cunning adversaries against heartless hunters, fighting for the lives of their “darling” mates (Coleman 193-206). While dramatized, with the wolves depicted as acting more like humans than wolves, these stories nevertheless triggered a more sympathetic outlook of the wolf for the American public, where in urban areas its reputation continued to climb amidst nostalgia for its impending extinction. The rise of the popularity of the wolf in the twentieth century may be attributed to the closing of the American West. As the dream of Manifest Destiny came true, with both coasts of the United States joined by statehood and rail, the supposedly “dying” ways of the Wild West and the frontier began to become a nostalgic curiosity for Euro-Americans in the early twentieth century, attracted by the idea of the “Noble Savage” and “purity” away from industrial life. The Noble Savage stereotype

involves the romanticization and denigration of indigenous peoples, where they are presented as innately “close to the Earth” and therefore more “animalistic” than whites, who are polarized as the opposite: alienated from nature, dependent on technology, and therefore more “rational” than their indigenous counterpart. Wolves also became a “noble savage,” and they became a symbol of whites’ view of the inevitable extinction of the Indigenous: saddening and nostalgic, but a necessary result of “progress.” Even with more public sympathy than in generations past, wolf hunts continued—by 1950, the Gray Wolf was considered extinct in the United States, except for Alaska and the far northern reaches of the Great Lakes region that bordered Canada.

However, neither did Indigenous peoples nor the wolf go extinct, unlike what whites expected. The romanticized wolf became a symbol of conservation, and in 1973, United States president Richard Nixon signed the Endangered Species Act, which qualified the Gray Wolf as an endangered species and provided it with legal protection. Their numbers increased, and with border crossings from Canada, there were approximately 2,000 wolves in the Great Lakes region by 1995. Wolves were even reintroduced to Yellowstone National Park in 1995, creating controversy as opposing ranchers, “romanticism, animal rights discourse, and Western notions of redemption” crossed and clashed (Jones 40). The introduced Canadian packs have since spread out of the park, establishing residency in neighboring states, where their increasing numbers spark as much panic in locals and ranchers as they do in the Great Lakes region.

### *Present-Day Controversy*

The Gray Wolf's protected status did not last indefinitely, however. After the United States Fish and Wildlife Service officially delisted the gray wolf (*Canis lupus*) from the Endangered Species List in January 2012, the states of Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan began to implement annual wolf harvests with quotas created and enforced by the Department of Natural Resources. While wolves were once very common throughout the North Woods, by the time the ESA was created, there only were approximately 750 wolves in Minnesota, 6 wolves in Michigan, and a small pack in Wisconsin (Minnesota Wolf Management Plan 15-16 2001).

The large tracts of public lands in the North Woods also contributes to wolf legal status. A large portion of the North Woods area is public land: in Minnesota alone, 57% of the three wolf zones are considered public lands. The Northeast Zone consists of 70% public land, the Northwest Zone 54%, and the East Central only 8% (9 wolf season info pdf 9). A tourist region, the North Woods contain many national and state parks and forests such as Voyageurs National Park in Minnesota and Hiawatha National Forest in Michigan. There are other types of public lands as well where the government allows hunting in designated hunting seasons, such as Wildlife Management Areas (WMA's), Waterfowl Production Areas (WPA's), Forest Legacy Conservation Areas, Walk-In Access (WIA) Programs, industrial forest lands, national wildlife refuges, and many portions of individual county lands (Hunting Land Locations, Minnesota DNR).

The United States Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) delisted the gray wolf (*Canis lupus*) as an endangered species off the Federal Register on December 28, 2011, with the rule taking effect on January 27<sup>th</sup>, 2012 (Minnesota Department of Natural Resources

Wolf Briefing 1 2012). Official delisting of a species can only occur when each state the animal resides in can scientifically prove that their numbers are great enough to sustain a healthy, continual population, but also when the states have created official management plans (Minnesota Wolf Management Plan 9 2001). While the gray wolf was delisted off the federal register in both 2007 and 2009, federal cases *Humane Society of the U.S. v. Kempthorne* (2008) and *Defenders of Wildlife v. Salazar* (2011) overturned the official delistings twice respectively, thus delaying the wolf's removal from the Endangered Species List. When a species is removed from the endangered species list, most management policies fall to the states and tribal authorities (Minnesota Wolf Management Plan 9 2001), where minimum numbers must be established and maintained to ensure the wolf population does not slide back into endangered status.

The DNR must maintain a minimum wolf population of 1,600 in Minnesota, 350 in Wisconsin outside of Indian reservations, and 200 in Michigan. The DNR carefully calculates the annual hunting quota based on current numbers and any possible vulnerabilities that may affect the wolf population. For example, in the coming 2013 hunting season in Minnesota, a set quota of 220 may be hunted or trapped, with the early season target as 106. However, even under protection from the ESA, Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan state laws allowed the killing of wolves under special circumstances. Many environmentalist groups refer to cases such as Minn.Stat.97B.645, which allows a human to kill a wolf even without a permit if it poses an immediate threat to human life, pets, or livestock (State of Minnesota In Court of Appeals 1). For example, before the wolf was delisted in 2011, Minnesota residents filed a total of 211 complaints related to damage of life and property from wolves, and 51.7% of the total complaints

were officially verified (109) by USDA inspection. Eighty-eight verified livestock-related incidences were reported in 2011, with 96 individual farms filing complaints, along with nine additional verified reports of wolves harassing or attacking domestic dogs. Residents officially reported a total of 97 wolves trapped, 215 captured, and 203 killed in 2011 (Minnesota Department of Natural Resources Wolf Briefing 3 2012). While Minnesota ranchers affected by wolves receive generous compensation from the government, with \$102,230 in total rewarded in 2011, many ranchers enthusiastically regard public wolf harvests as an effective method to prevent further harm to livestock.

The Anishinaabe communities rushed to respond to the delisting of wolves. All seven Ojibwe reservations in Minnesota have forbidden wolf hunting on their lands, and Wisconsin's six Ojibwe bands have officially declared to not take part in the wolf harvests (Kraker 2012). The Red Lake reservation designated their entire 830,000 acre reservation as a wolf "sanctuary" in 2010, and the White Earth reservation will only allow wolves to be killed for specific ceremonial purposes or if they pose an immediate threat to humans or livestock (Robertson 2013). However, with the exception of the Red Lake and Grand Portage reservations, who own nearly all of the land within their borders, the ban on wolf hunting in Anishinaabe reservations is difficult to enforce because many of the reservations only own a small portion of the lands. For example, the Leech Lake reservation owns only 4% of the land within its borders, and the Fond du Lac band only about a third, with the "rest a checkerboard of private, county, state, and federal land" (Kraker 2012). The wolf harvest controversy also involves the long-standing issue over private versus public land as it pertains to Indigenous peoples, with Minnesota DNR commissioner Tom Lendwehr rejecting the requests of Minnesota's Anishinaabe to ban

wolf hunting on private property and state-owned property within reservation boundaries, as it would violate the law. However, the government of Wisconsin granted Ojibwe nations within the state the right to forbid wolf hunting entirely within reservation boundaries (Kraker 2012), which of course cannot extend to previously held Anishinaabe lands outside of the reservations.

Clint Carroll, a member of the Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma and professor of American Indian Studies at the University of Minnesota states that while the Minnesota DNR says that it cannot consider “cultural arguments,” their stance is problematic because “1) tribal governments represent sovereign nations, not cultural interest groups, and 2) the Minnesota DNR cannot claim objectivity or impartiality, because it fundamentally represents dominant cultural values that define wolves as ‘resources’ rather than relatives” (Carroll 2013). In a human dominionistic narrative, wolves cannot be relatives because they reside in a place below humans on the interspecies hierarchy, where non-human animals only exist to benefit humans as resources. In the place of God or a divine hierarchy, secular law becomes the apex of the hierarchy. As modern U.S. law has been shaped by thousands of years of Eurasian paradigms and narratives concerning the larger environment, it cannot by nature be unbiased nor always take into account long-standing indigenous environmental relations. Thus even land relations in the United States are constructed on a type of hierarchy, with European paradigms and narratives residing “above” indigenous ones, constructed by dominionism and colonization.

*Conclusion*

Narratives, such as Euro-Christian perceptions of human dominionism, hierarchy, and private property, shape the social and physical aspects of a landscape. As all of “human thought is ‘irreducibly imaginative’” (Newcomb xvi), Euro-Christian narratives and tropes are imposed on the North American continent and shape local environments, including human perceptions of the land. In other words, stories influence the surrounding environments in which they are part of. While narratives exist in the minds and cultures of different beings, the mind is also a product of the surrounding environment and the relationships one has with its beings. The mind is ““an embodied process formed in interaction with the physical and social world,”” and it creates meaning, which ““arises in the imaginative interactions of the human organism with its world, and these embodied experiences provide both the grounding and the structure for human thought and rationality”” (Newcomb 1-2). Embodied experiences become culture, and in turn become narrative and constructed paradigms that humans and other beings participate in and create. Narrative is relational, and arises from a kind of mutual dialogue among different beings in the environment, both human and non-human, which becomes history as well as the continually made present.

However, narrative- and history-making are not exclusively anthropocentric: non-human animals such as wolves, plants, and even geological features all shape these continually created narratives and history, as seen in the Anishinaabe/wolf relationship, and thus influence the way humans behave in and perceive the world. As complex social communities and confluences of narratives, both Europe and the Great Lakes region are products of the narratives each being weaves into the wider environment, which in turn shapes and influences other beings. Narrative is relational and environmental, with both

Anishinaabe and European narratives and philosophical paradigms a result of mutual interactions and relationships with the landscape.

Unlike the *bimaadiziwin* framework that the Anishinaabe use to create their social protocol, narratives, and history with, where relations with wolves are essential for the physical and spiritual health of a human being, Europeans and Euro-Americans often related to the environment with narratives of hierarchy and human-bounded space: only human-developed and controlled land could be considered ideal, with those out of its boundaries as “uncontrolled” and “bestial.” As in Genesis, where Adam and Eve remained safe as long as they were contained in the boundaries of the tamed Garden of Eden, the lands and creatures outside were uncontrolled and therefore feared. Non-domesticated animals are “wild,” and thus lie outside of human dominion unless deliberately controlled. To the European and Euro-American imagination, the wolf perhaps symbolized the sins and “savagery” within and without the human rational soul, who obstructed the divine goal of creating the land in humans’ image.

In more secular terms, the wolf is an untamed beast threatening to consume dollars and personal property, and inhibiting the progress of globalized capitalism. In either case, wolves do not help one to become human—rather, they are the antithesis of being human and they reduce humans’ well-being. While Euro-American narratives and paradigms of interspecies hierarchy, dominionism, and personal property are embedded in the landscape of the Great Lakes region and shape the lives of the beings who inhabit it, Anishinaabe narratives still reside in the land, and are equally as valid as the colonizers’ law. In the concept of *bimaadiziwin*, narrative, history, and ways of knowing

and being become intertwined, and ma'iingan is one such source of these concepts. It is the next chapter where I turn to *bimaadiziwin* as a valid non-hierarchical ecological model for the Great Lakes region, and ma'iingan as an episteme and ontology for humans.

### CHAPTER 3: WOLVEN TRADITIONAL KNOWLEDGE

In Anishinaabe traditional thought, knowledge is a complementary reciprocal process between non-human beings and human beings, where each helps to create their respective social worlds. Anishinaabe Traditional Ecological Knowledge is relational, with epistememes and ontology as mutually arising from and interdependent with the wider environmental social network. Johnston states that human interdependency with plants, animals, and *manidoo* goes so far that “Mother Earth has formed our beliefs, attitudes, insights, outlooks, values and institutions” (vii 2003), and that the ancestors of the Anishinaabeg “owed their lives and what they knew of food, medicines, life, and living from the animals, birds, and insects”—having learned to live in a clan from ma’iingan (112 2003). Non-humans not only have more power than humans, as described in chapter one, but also arguably more knowledge to share because of their creation before humans. Knowledge derived from non-human sources is not only necessary on a subsistence level, but also a social level—where worldviews and ways of being are constructed and maintained.

While both modern Western science and TEK are derived from long-term empirical observation, and they both acknowledge the interdependence of beings in the environment, TEK acknowledges that the interdependency can go beyond physical sustenance to a type of complex cultural exchange. In TEK, non-humans can have their own knowledge systems garnered from their own empirical observations of the environment, which are then observed and emulated by humans to achieve well-being. Human systems of knowledge and being may then be largely constructed from non-humans, making epistemological and ontological processes relational and not exclusively

human. Wolves, as highly social animals like humans, are an excellent example of non-human entities whose social structure has influenced human thought. As parallel brother to the Anishinaabeg, ma'iingan provides knowledge that has an important place in Anishinaabe thought and ways of being, applicable to the larger environment in the Great Lakes. Wolf-based knowledge and being is relational, where such an approach is a valid addition to hierarchical ecological models of mainstream Western science because of the way in which it presents a non-hierarchical ecological model that accounts for not only interrelated empirical phenomena, but also mutual social knowledge and well-being formation among all beings. A wolf-based epistemology becomes a way in which one may approach their greater environment, the Great Lakes and beyond, and a way to deconstruct hierarchical models of ecology where humans are the primary source of environmental knowledge, disregarding other beings' influences.

### *Wolf Behavior*

Since the Anishinaabe view the wolf as a relative, and wolf pack structure reflects how they operate primarily as social animals, they consider the wolf pack to be a clan. Ways of knowledge based upon the wolf are thus kin- and clan-based, where one must operate from the perspective of benefitting their community. A wolf-based epistemology may show how participation in certain social roles strengthens a community, as well as the communitarian aspect of personhood, where a person acknowledges they are always embedded in a network of living beings. Benton-Banai notes the similarities between the two species, drawing behavioral and historical parallels: "Both the Indian and the wolf have come to be alike and experience the same thing. Both of them have a mate for life. Both have a Clan [*sic*] system and a tribe. Both have had their land taken from them.

Both of them have been hunted for their... hair. And both have been pushed very close to destruction” (8). Since Anishinaabeg and wolves have many similarities, the Anishinaabeg may interpret wolf behavior through the lens of the *doodem* and its roles.

An overview of wolf behavior and social structure is essential to understand what a wolf-based epistemology may look like. Wolves nearly always live in a pack, with a pack normally led by a breeding male and female and their progeny. The term “alpha” for the leaders of a pack is misleading; nearly any wolf of sexual maturity who breeds can obtain the status to be the main leader. Status in a wolf pack is usually more about age than aggressive competition, with the quintessential roles of “alpha,” “beta,” and “omega” more common among unrelated captive wolves, or nonrelated wild wolves in stressful situations such as food scarcity, than in typical packs of related non-captive wolves (Mech 1 1999). Nearly all wolves have the potential to become breeders and therefore leaders of a pack, countering the popular image of a wolf pack led by the most aggressive competitors dominating subordinate unrelated wolves of approximately the same age. The term “alpha” is a misnomer because “any parent is dominant to its young offspring, so ‘alpha’ adds no further information” (Mech 5 1999). Breeders often automatically become what may be interpreted as “alphas” of a pack, with no inherent permanent status within their pack (Mech 4 1999). Mech states that

... the much-touted wolf dominance hierarchy is a primary reflection of the age, sex, and reproductive structure of the group.... The typical wolf pack, then, should be viewed as a family with the adult parents guiding the group and sharing group leadership in a division-of-labor system in which the female predominates primarily in activities such as pup care and defense and the male primarily during

foraging and food-provisioning and travels associated with them... Dominance displays are uncommon except during competition for food. Then they allow parents to monopolize food and allocate it to their youngest offspring. Active submission appears to be primarily a food-begging gesture or a food-gathering motivator (11-12 1999).

The basic wolf pack consists of the breeders, their cubs born in a given year, the cubs' yearling siblings, and occasionally their older siblings above the ages of two. A breeder's offspring stay with their parents and their pack for normally about one to three years; afterwards, they often disperse and form new packs with other dispersers. Most wolves find other dispersed wolves to create a new pack, making leadership status potentially available for any wolf (Mech 4-5 1999). Dispersers also occasionally join new packs where they are sometimes adopted, and this adoption can be temporary or permanent. Normally only young wolves are accepted into a new pack, with full adults often not accepted into the pack unless one of the pack's breeder has been killed (Mech & Boitani 2). Large packs with many nonrelated members are rare, created normally when wolves live where their primary source of food is large prey like moose. In Minnesota, pack sizes may range from only a mated pair to as many as over twenty, with an average winter pack consisting of five to six members (Mech 57 2000b). Larger packs may also be created during abundant conditions when there is more than one breeding pair, typically consisting of the mother and daughter(s), but extra pairings are generally limited by the primary breeders (Mech & Boitani 3 2003). The act of limiting the breeding pairs, as well as the dispersement of young wolves from their natal packs, are methods that

reduces conflict within packs by minimizing sex and food-related competition as much as possible, avoiding conflicts among parents, their offspring, and siblings.

While traditionally the framework for understanding wolf society is through a linear hierarchical dominance model consisting of the alpha male at the top, and the omega at the bottom, wolf pack structure may be more nuanced than a simple linear model. Another model proposed for understanding wolf social structure is of two separate same-sex linear models with the breeding male and breeding female each exerting dominance over their subadult, yearling, and young offspring of the same sex. However, while these models may be applicable in packs consisting of nonrelated members, they are not typical in most wild packs of related members. Instead, a third model is proposed: one of a web of familial relationships, where the breeding male and female demonstrate the most authority, with each successive age group of their offspring as demonstrating less and less authority. Interestingly, this is similar to the social order of the Anishinaabeg, where elders often have the most status in their community and have responsibility for the education of the young. Life in a wolf pack is “balanced between cohesive and conflicting behaviors,” with “‘submissive’ behavior as the persistence of care-soliciting by offspring who remained in the family as adults” (Packard 52). “Submissive” behavior, such as a wolf rolling on its back, tucking its tail in between its legs, etc., may be a type of ritualized code of behavior that wolves follow when confronted by their parent or elder wolf, much like the proper social protocol of respect among the Anishinaabe between elders and their younger kin. For example, children traditionally did not walk in front of elders, because it was a disrespectful act (McNally 134).

While many descriptions of wolf behavior include words such as “submission” or “dominance,” one may question whether or not these terms are culturally dependent on Western conceptions of power. One could also easily in addition interpret wolf social behavior as acknowledgement of interdependent roles and respect for elders and leaders, which may be more in line with Anishinaabe cultural norms. Packard states that “perhaps the relative importance of dominance varies with pack composition, food availability (and thus competition), and even the eyes of the observer” (52). Since most academic studies of wolves have been conducted by primarily Westerners, interpretations of wolf social structure may reveal just as much about Western attitudes of hierarchical dominionism as it does about wolf behavior. While linear models of dominance mediated through aggression sometimes do occur in wolf packs, especially in disrupted (nonrelated) packs, during intense food competition in times of scarcity, or during mating season, ritualized appeasement behavior and affection is far more common in creating social cohesion than physical violence. A study of two captive wolf packs, labeled the North and South packs, attests to the way in which certain ritualized behaviors during feeding reflects social cohesion or lack thereof:

In the North pack, two adult daughters approached their father in a low crouch, and he pinned each to the ground with an inhibited muzzle-bite typical of a caregiver interrupting begging pups. The grown daughters stayed away from the [deer] carcass until their father was finished. In this nuclear family, order of feeding at the carcass was correlated with appeasement, not conflict, behaviors. Appeasement gestures reduce the probability of escalation of conflict after it has started.

In the captive South pack (a disrupted family), I watched two 6-month-old juveniles approach their foster father while he was feeding from a deer carcass. When he snarled at them, they lay down and looked the other way until he returned to chewing on the carcass. Not completely intimidated, the juveniles crept closer while the male was feeding and eventually fed beside him without conflict. In this family, in contrast to the North pack, the order of feeding at the carcass was correlated with conflict interactions, not with appeasement. Apparently the juveniles had not yet learned to use ritualized appeasing gestures, as their small size conveyed little threat to their foster father (Packard 57).

In this example, the wolves who demonstrated their status as offspring, as a pup would, through appeasement behaviors were more likely to obtain access to meat more peacefully than the wolves who did not appease before approaching. By using gestures a small pup would use, it conveys to the breeding father that they are not disrespectful to their parent, and it evokes a care-giving response from them. If pack members are familiar with one another, as in a related and non-disrupted pack, they learn and reinforce each other's patterns of behavior making appeasement behaviors more effective. The more nutritionally-deprived and intimidated individuals are, the less likely they will solve conflict through appeasement rituals, with less intimidated wolves more likely to approach their parents and older siblings with puppy-like body language (Packard 57). In the eyes of an Anishinaabe, the North pack scenario may demonstrate use of respect with an elder figure, and the South pack scenario a lack of it. Wolf social dynamics where the eldest parents eat first may not be seen as dominance or oppression, but respect and proper behavior.

Besides age and breeding status, leadership status is flexible, and is affected by internal processes and reactions to external events. Being a wolf leader is not a given but more of a dynamic “internal state (or mood)... [where] Moods are subject to change as the health and environment of an individual change. According to a model of human behavior, moods are influenced by both temperament (heritable propensities) and character (learned styles of coping)” (Packard 54). While leadership status is not heritable in wolves, individual temperaments can be, with assertive communicators more likely to have more status within a pack. Assertive members of the pack are associated with more conflict behaviors, and avoidance behaviors (i.e. humbleness and “submissive” behavior) associated with less conflict. However, learned responses to the environment (i.e. character) also greatly influence wolf behavior, so assertive coping mechanisms may change into avoidance behaviors and vice versa due to social experiences, stressful situations, and mood changes. Contrary to the popular vision of the wolf as unduly aggressive and bloodthirsty, wolf packs normally get along peacefully and engage in many ritualistic affectionate behaviors to maintain cohesion, with overt hostility normally reserved for the encroachment of neighboring packs or with competition for food and mates (Packard 57-58, 61).

Relationships among wolves are not as rigid as some previous biologists thought: while the breeding pair(s) influences their offspring, the offspring also influence their parents, with no one wolf leading and making all decisions for the pack autocratically. In lieu of a “dominance hierarchy” model, the “attention center” hypothesis may be more applicable to wolf social structures, where more attention is placed on the breeding pair in most situations, such as how offspring are more likely to follow their parents than vice

versa. However, the attention center can shift depending on mood and circumstance (such as during cubbing season, when the attention center is placed on pups) (Packard 60-61). Thus, an alternative model of viewing wolf social structure may better reflect wolf behavior—a *bimaadiziwin* model.

### *Anishinaabe views of Wolf Culture*

There are parallels between Anishinaabe social structure and wolf social structure, especially in clan living and leadership. In Anishinaabe narrative, clans emerged when the Anishinaabeg lived on the eastern coast of North America long ago, before their migration inland to the Great Lakes region. William Warren documents the story of the origin of the clans:

When the Earth was new, the An-ish-in-aub-ag lived, congregated on the shores of a great salt water. From the bosom of the deep there suddenly appeared six beings in human form, who entered their wigwams.

One of these strangers kept a covering over his eyes, and he dared not look on the An-ish-in-aub-ag, though he showed the greatest anxiety to do so. At last he could no longer restrain his curiosity, and on one occasion he partially lifted his veil, and his eye fell on the form of a human being, who instantly fell dead as if struck by one of the thunderers. Though the intentions of this dread being were friendly to the An-ish-in-aub-ag, yet the glance of his eye was too strong, and inflicted certain death. His fellows, therefore, caused him to return into the bosom of the great water from which they apparently emerged.

The others, who now numbered five, remained with the An-ish-in-aub-ag, which became a blessing to them; from them originate the five great clans or Totems... (18-19).

Another version of this story describes the six different beings as emerging from the ocean, with one of them deciding to turn away from the hot sun at the surface and go back into the sea, while the other five moved onto the shore and lived with the Anishinaabeg (Peacock & Wisuri 75). Each clan has a certain function within Anishinaabe society, with Basil Johnston explaining them as divided up between “leadership (chiefs), defense (warriors), sustenance (hunters), learning (teachers), and medicine (healers). From these five principal [*doodem*], others were added. The wolf clan is one of the *doodem* of defense, and more specifically associated with the qualities of perseverance and guardianship (Johnston 64 1976) with those of this clan descended from ma’iingan. He states that:

Animals of fierce disposition, the bear, the wolf, the lynx, were the totems of warriors. Warriors were a necessary evil... they were necessary to defend family and community from attacks... In times of danger, the leadership of the community was entrusted to a war leader for the duration of the crisis. With the passing of danger the war chief was required to surrender his leadership role. During crisis the war chief had only limited authority and power, proportionate to the number of warriors who followed him. Even then he had little control over his own men and probably less among the other members of the community whom he could neither compel nor restrain (64).

There are parallels between the dynamics of wolf leadership and Anishinaabe leadership. An Anishinaabe leader, as a rule, cannot have absolute authority over his or her followers (C. Miller 75)—rather, leadership is derived from the principles of power in Anishinaabe culture, a reliance of interdependent relationships (C. Miller 115). Leaders are defined as “a man or woman who counted many followers and one on whom many people relied” (Johnston 23 1995). Wolf leaders also do not have absolute control over their offspring, and their power is only measured by the numbers of cooperative kin they have. Wolf leaders, in addition to being seen as elders, can also be seen as playing the role of an Anishinaabe leader or that of an important *manidoo*. As recalled from chapter one, non-humans have more power than humans because they are not as interdependent with other beings for survival, with more independence meaning more power.

Conversely, power in humans is measured by the quality of interdependent relationships one has with other beings. Older individuals typically have more power due to their greater experience in life and thus more opportunities to establish more relationships, although age is no guarantee of greater power—power is measured through the quality of relationships one has with *manidoog* and other non-human beings. Leadership in Anishinaabe communities is created this way, and even *ogimaag*, or political leaders who inherited their positions, derive their power from the *manidoog* and other beings.

In contrast to the *ogimaag*, military leaders (*mayosewininwag*) and religious Midewiwin leaders (*gechi-midewijig*) obtained their positions through charismatic leadership qualities, although many charismatic leaders were also hereditary leaders (C. Miller 115). Military leaders maintained their positions only if they were consistently successful in war parties and revenge killings, aided by the *manidoog* and visions of

battle strategies, with *mayosewininwag* positions open to potentially anyone regardless of lineage (C. Miller 115). While elder and parental status is the primary way in which wolf leaders are determined, leadership status is also flexible and potentially available to all wolves because it is also a dynamic mood process, and not a hereditary character trait, somewhat similar to charismatic leadership among the Anishinaabeg. Two schools of thought predominate among wolf biologists: the determinist and the stochastic perspectives, which inform leadership and pack dynamics.

According to the deterministic perspective, events in the natural world unfold according to certain predictable or predetermined rules and return to steady states. In contrast, from the stochastic perspective, order is apparent only at a specific time as a reflection of chance events. The dynamic changes between relatively steady states are characterized in terms of probabilities (Packard 42).

A stochastic perspective allows for a nuanced understanding of wolf leadership, where it allows for various internal and external factors to shape the roles of wolf leadership. Wolf leadership as completely dependent on parental status is a deterministic perspective, whereas wolf leadership dependent on not only parental status but also internal mood processes is a stochastic perspective (Packard 54). *Mayosiwininiwag* and *gechi-midewijig*, as charismatic positions, may be partly determined by hereditary status, but they are more likely to be dependent on external circumstances and needs, as well as internal moods and personalities. Their influence is determined by stochastic factors, and dependent on the quality of relationships with their kin and other beings. Because leadership in wolf communities is primarily determined by parental status, a deterministic approach to wolf leadership may seem to be the best approach to understanding pack

dynamics, but a *bimaadiziwin*-centered approach would emphasize how actions creating and maintaining relationships among pack members determine leadership status as well. Not only does parental status make a wolf leader, but also so do the methods and actions in which they lead—making wolf leadership a dynamic process of eldership between parents and offspring and not purely a given. Like the functions of Anishinaabe clans, Wolf leaders must follow certain roles and assume certain responsibilities to be successful, with the enforcement of cooperative actions among kin a key determinant in pack success.

The roles of elder and leader are intertwined in both Anishinaabe society and wolf society. *Ogimaag*, *mayosiwininiwag*, and *gechi-midewijig* all included the guidance of *gichi-anishinaabeg*, or respected elders, in village councils to make political and community decisions, and leaders would be criticized for making decisions without their input (C. Miller 75). Likewise, wolf leaders as parents and elders to their kin are responsible for the pack's well-being and make communal decisions. Both the mother and father wolf have certain roles, and there is a flexible and permeable division of labor between the two, similar to gendered divisions of labor traditionally among the Anishinaabeg. The “female [wolf] predominates primarily in such activities as pup care and defense and the male primarily during foraging and food-provisioning and the travels associated with them” (Mech 11 1999). During the early phases of pup care, the female wolf seems to have more power than the male, with the male posturing deferentially during this time (Mech 11 1999). Among the Anishinaabeg, traditional gender roles for men included hunting, battle, and political affairs, while women practiced agriculture, processed food, managed the household, and were the primary executors of sugarbushing

and wild ricing (C. Miller 66-67), but these roles were by no means exclusionary. For example, women were also involved in warfare and political leadership (C. Miller 128). Anishinaabe “society viewed men’s and women’s contributions to family and community as balanced with one another, requiring that women’s concerns be acknowledged in the political system” (C. Miller 48).

Similarly, the breeding male and female’s roles of a wolf pack can also be seen as complementary and non-exclusionary, with no particular role assuming higher status than another. Wolf gender roles are not absolute, and all wolves regardless of gender contribute to the welfare of their family or clan. For example, father wolves help to take care of their cubs, especially by regurgitating food for the mother (Mech 7-8 2000a). The primary responsibility of all wolves is to ensure that their young are raised healthily and properly, with all wolves caring for the pups. The roles of wolves for the care of their pups can be conceived of as a set of interlocking relationships much like a web, or that of *bimaadiziwin*. A *bimaadiziwin*-based model for understanding wolf social dynamics is a way in which Anishinaabe TEK may be applied to current scientific understandings of wolf social ecology, where it resonates more with a web-type model of social interaction than a simple linear model.

Like a clan, every member of a pack has relational obligations to one another, with parents as well as the offspring contributing to the general welfare of the pack. While wolf parents and leaders may be seen as having more power than their children because of their longer life experiences and their ability to survive with less dependence on other beings than their offspring who are beginning to be acquainted with the larger environment, a rigid top-down linear model of control does not entirely apply to social

dynamics between parents and their offspring. While the parent wolves may normally feed first at a kill unless the prey is quite large, the order of feeding may be an adaptive mechanism that prioritizes the health of their youngest cubs first. Interestingly,

... pups are subordinate to both parents and to older siblings, yet they are fed preferentially by the parents, and even by their older (dominant) siblings. On the other hand, parents both dominate older offspring and restrict their food intake when food is scarce, feeding pups instead. Thus, the most practical effect of social dominance is to allow the dominant individual the choice of to whom to allot food (Mech 9 1999).

In this sense, young pups have considerable influence on the behavior of their parents and older siblings, enforcing a web-based model of wolf social ecology and not a purely linear one. A wolf of one year of age is fully grown and independently functional and therefore does not require frequent feedings like a rapidly growing young pup, and wolf pups who are not fully grown by five months typically do not survive past a year (Mech 78 2000d). Having the parent wolves prioritize food for the pups and restrict it for their older offspring is not a “cruel” action, nor a sign of absolute dominance. If food scarcity and restriction is an issue within a pack, the offspring typically disperse early to form their own packs (Mech & Boitani 13). However, even yearling and subadult wolves prioritize the welfare of the youngest offspring, and regurgitate food for them as well as help teach them skills for survival.

Like Anishinaabe elders, the parent wolves and their older children teach the pups life skills and how to conduct themselves properly with one another and the larger environment. Similar to Anishinaabe methods of teaching, wolf pups are taught through

observing their parents and older siblings and by example. Around the age of five to ten weeks, the pups emerge from the den and begin to explore the environment, and rely upon the regurgitated meat that their parents and older siblings carry from their stomachs deposited when the pups poke an older wolf's muzzle, a behavior known as "licking up." This behavior continues into adulthood, where "it serves an additional function of appeasement of conflict" with its parents and older siblings by demonstrating that a wolf is, like a pup, no threat to them (Packard 48-49). They begin to use instinctual and learned ways of proper behavior and body language such as tail wagging, high posture, low posture, and "active" and "passive submission" and learn their significance. "Active submission" is when a wolf approaches another with more authority with respect, where the head is placed lower than the other's and the wolf "licks up" the other, whereas "passive submission" is when a wolf lies on the ground and exposes its belly and the other wolf smells the groin (Mech 6 1999). However, these behaviors may not always be seen as dominance but as a certain type of social protocol. Mech states that common "passive submission" tactics such as "standing over," where an older wolf stands over a younger wolf and nudges their muzzle into the other's, is not a dominance display and is abundant during peaceful times (8 1999). He also acknowledges that dominance-related behaviors from previous wolf studies may depend on the eye of the observer, where

...at least some of the difference in reported "hostility" might be due to different viewpoints of the observers. I occasionally saw intense "pinning" of a 2 year-old female by her mother in summer 1994 that some might label "hostile." However, to me this behavior appeared to be merely the type of interaction I observed

between the mother and an errant pup she could not control. In any case, these types of interaction were uncommon during my study (Mech 9 1999).

As food-begging and “active submission” are nearly indistinguishable, and “passive submission” is similar to reigning in inappropriate behavior from pups, “submission” may be holdover behaviors from puppy times to ensure social cohesion and reduce conflict in a familial group situation. In an Anishinaabe perspective, these types of behaviors may not be interpreted as “dominant” or “submissive,” but rather a form of learned respect for elders communally enforced in which younger members of a clan or family participate. This fits in with looking at wolf social dynamics in a *bimaadiziwin* framework, where continual relations with elders (human and non-human) is what gives life and survival. The

...proper regard for elders is elemental to the proper functioning of *bimaadiziwin*. It is modeled on and, in turn, serves as a model for relations with spiritual beings, since the ethical and ritual practices honoring elders are congruent to those honoring spirits, the “grandfathers.” The specific practices of decorum toward elders, then, are not just good manners, but constitutive of *bimaadiziwin*, the harmonious, beautiful, natural circle of life (McNally 93).

Elder wolves have significance for humans as well: in Anishinaabe culture even an old non-human can earn the designation of being a *gichi-aya'aa*, or “great being,” along with human elders, and they “can model and teach ethics to human people (McNally 87). By observing the lives of social non-human animals, and defining and incorporating the potential teachings of elder wolves, humans can also learn to cooperate with and respect other beings, thus achieving *bimaadiziwin*. This respect and deference

for human and non-human elders is interwoven with Anishinaabe ways of knowing and being, where a primary component of a wolf-based epistemology and ontology may be respect. Without proper respect and cooperation, social animals such as wolves, and by extension, humans, could not survive. The parent elder wolves are the primary source of knowledge and well-being for their offspring, just as elders are in an Anishinaabe community, and they can extend their knowledge and ways of well-being to humans as well.

### *Hunting & Predatory Behavior*

Parent wolves and older siblings also teach a fundamental aspect of wolf culture to the pups: hunting. Hunting requires careful observation of environmental phenomena and protocol, where one is not “triumphing” over the environment but working within vast numbers of interrelated phenomena wherein proper behavior is paramount for survival. The pups’ training in social protocol becomes useful when they begin to learn to hunt, where not only do they learn to apply it within their pack but also to fulfill their larger social and ecological role as predators. Their training in hunting begins when they begin to be mobile, and learn to cache small prey in the den they caught themselves nearby. The older wolves begin to bring back increasingly larger prey to the den for them to eat, allowing them to establish familiarity and experience with the local prey species. It is also around this time where the pups emerge from the den that they begin to play among each other and with the adult wolves; this play is important for the refinement of motor skills, hunting tactics (such as pouncing), and for social skills (Packard 50). The pups’ instinct for following the older wolves leads them to experience their first hunting expeditions around the age of three months, where they observe the actions of the older

wolves and begin to participate. From the ages of four to ten months they are in a type of “hunting school” where they continue to learn about and refine their hunting skills in preparation to disperse from their natal packs (Packard 51-52) and begin teaching their own offspring.

The stories of the Original Human and Nanabozho learning about hunting from ma’iingan are similar to when cubs join their family on hunting trips, with humans and Nanabozho becoming like a pup or of a child joining his or her clan hunting party. Ma’iingan as brother to the Anishinaabeg underscores the commonality between the two as traditionally hunters, with both fulfilling their role as predators. This relationship does not exist to the same extent in Europeans, with Pierotti stating that “...people of the Western philosophical tradition tend to regard themselves as prey. As a consequence, individuals who follow this tradition of fear thus try to exterminate any potential predator. In contrast, followers of Indigenous philosophical traditions tend to regard themselves as predators and show respect for the nonhumans who share their ecological role” (49). As fellow predators, Anishinaabeg and ma’iingan play similar roles in their environment, where by carefully observing the movements of other beings and understanding them, they may survive and contribute to ecological balance.

While modern conservationist ethics often dictate that less human interference is more beneficial for the environment, direct involvement such as humans fulfilling the role of predator is not contrary to environmental dynamics, with predation as a necessary process in the web of *bimaadiziwin*. To assume human processes do not belong in the environment stems from the belief that the human and non-human realms are inherently separate, with humanity as “transcendent” from the natural world of “wildness” and

“savagery.” In an Anishinaabe context, the environment cannot be “wild” or “untamed” simply because humans are not assumed to live outside of its processes. Predation has its place in contributing to ecological balance, and predators such as wolves fulfilling their role as hunters is not a violent or “wild and bloodthirsty” act. The place of predation in contributing to ecological balance is clearly explained by Fikret Berkes, who says of the Cree, the Anishinaabe’s northerly relatives, that they

...have difficulty with the Western notions that hunting involves suffering on the part of the animals, and that the best conservation (as some argue) would mean not hunting the animals at all. To the Cree, if the game want to be left alone, they would let the hunters know. Otherwise the proper conservation of game does include the hunting and eating of animals. The preservationist ethic is not compatible with Cree conservation: “When you don’t use a resource, you lose respect for it.” This notion is common to all northern indigenous peoples, and many indigenous peoples throughout the world... (33).

In this excerpt, hunting is not presented as merely a skill, but as a dynamic process interdependent with the desires and needs of non-humans. It is only through observation, sharp senses, and continual relationships with prey that a hunter can determine whether or not the game is willing to give up its life. To be successful with hunting, it requires full immersion into an environment and thus a good relationship with its beings, which takes hard work and time.

Rupert Ross, in describing how a First Nations hunter may acquire the knowledge to be successful, relates his time as a fishing guide and the formation of empirical patterns required to predict good fishing areas. As time passed, he was able to distinguish

active spots by relating subtle atmospheric conditions with previous fishing attempts in certain areas, thus establishing a nearly instantaneous subconscious link to favorable spots depending on the day. Over time, he began to “image” the areas after spending time on the dock each day, absorbing his general impressions of the current conditions, and he could “feel” which areas were favorable to fish and others which were not before even setting out into the water although he could often not explain the process or his conclusions. He regarded it as largely subconscious and “a very complex and compacted form of reasoning... [where] Observational skills had to be accompanied by a storing of those patterns in memory and by a skill at comparing those stored patterns, in their incredible diversity, with the ever-changing patterns of the day at hand” (82-86).

As the above account demonstrates, hunting relies on the full use of the senses, empiricism, and the acknowledgement that one must work with the surrounding conditions, and not outside of them. Ross states that hunting is not “going after” something, but is rather positioning oneself in such a way that the hunter “receives” the prey by attuning to the weather, the prey’s behavior, the time of year, etc. (89). With their sharp senses and hunting way of life, wolves teach by example how human hunters ought to conduct themselves in an outdoor setting, with careful cultivation of the senses and learned patterns to make an accurate assumption of how to best hunt game in particular conditions. A wolf-based epistemology would incorporate the long-term interconnections of the environment, with the acquisition of knowledge as result of established relationships with interrelated phenomena and beings.

Furthermore, as hunting is a type of partnership between predator and prey, a wolf-based epistemology and ontology would emphasize established ecological

dependencies as valid and necessary. A *bimaadiziwin* framework may be applicable as relational models for the dynamics of a wolf pack, where an Anishinaabe perspective of the wolf clan would perhaps be that individual wolves know how to interact with one another as a family and kin group, such as how a grandparent would interact with a grandchild, an older sister with a younger sister, etc. Wolves view their whole pack as relatives, whether or not they are related by blood. While wolves sometimes kill new wolves who desire to join the pack, they also can readily adopt them as well. The highly social nature of wolves compels them to join and work together as a unit, much like humans.

### *Conclusion*

Overall, a wolf-based epistemology and ontology is relational and empirical, two key components of TEK (Pierotti 9). Ways of knowing are based on the patient cultivation of the physical and mental senses, informed by the concept of *bimaadiziwin*—a way of being. As *bimaadiziwin* emphasizes the need for establishing relationships with the environment for a good-quality, long life, achievable only through continual efforts and reciprocity, knowledge is not solely a human endeavor—it is a communal and mutually arising process wherein non-human knowledge is a large component and informant of human knowledge. Rather than conceptualizing human knowledge as lying on a linear hierarchy, with non-human knowledge as inferior to or nearly irrelevant to humans, knowledge is an interdependent matrix of all beings in an environment, with human life depending on non-human knowledge. Here, knowledge is not only originating from the human brain or human societies, but also from complex social processes that include the social lives of non-humans.

Since European narrative and philosophy emphasize an interspecies hierarchy, knowledge, ecological or otherwise, arguably lies on a hierarchy as well. At the top of the hierarchy is human knowledge, with non-human knowledge rendered as unimportant or non-existent in the lives and well-being of humans. The reification of the “rational” in the environment excludes the experiences and cultures of non-human beings because of their perceived inherent “irrationality” and position below that of humans, and so the ways in which non-human beings shape human knowledge and transmit it is neglected in modern scientific study. Since the concepts of the interspecies hierarchy and human dominionism have been entrenched in Western thought for so long, non-human beings are not normally considered persons with full agency in Western popular imagination, and thus cannot have “cultures” or have knowledge systems that significantly influence human epistemes or ways of being. While various animal behaviors are documented and studied, linking them to ecological interdependence, the study of non-human animals is not generally included within the realm of the social sciences or humanities because of their historical relegation as entities categorically separate and apart from humans. In Anishinaabe TEK, interdependence with the beings of the local environment is not only ecological in the modern Western scientific sense, but also a social process wherein human cultures are shaped by and interdependent with non-human cultures.

As social mammals, both wolves and humans share certain parallels in culture and social practice, noted in the narratives of ma’iingan and the Anishinaabeg. With wolves so closely intertwined with the Anishinaabeg, wolf-based epistemology and ontology is an important part of Anishinaabe ways of knowing and being, with Anishinaabe narratives describing how it was wolf-based knowledge and social protocol that informed

humans of proper ways to live. Anishinaabe and ma'iingan knowledge are both relational and sources of well-being for one another, with human relationships with wolves as a way to achieve *bimaadiziwin*. As all beings participate in *bimaadiziwin*, relationships with any being can promote *bimaadiziwin*, including wolves. This view stands in contrast to many modern western conceptions of wolves, where wolves are either a threat to humanity or are beneficial only on a superficial ecological level. The social and scientific study of the Great Lakes region should not ignore or exclude the knowledge of wolves and other beings on human behavior, making the area not only an ecological interrelated community on a physical level but also on a mental and social level. The expansion of the study of the Great Lakes region as a place inhabited by numerous *bimaadiziwad*, or beings who help others achieve *bimaadiziwad*, from that of a cause-and-effect chain of subsistence is an excellent example of how an Anishinaabe component of TEK can be applied to modern academic study. In this framework, wolves are a necessary component of human life on many levels, and is a way in which Anishinaabe TEK may be removed from the margins of academic study and integrated into the interrelated social sphere of the Great Lakes.

## CONCLUSION

During the time of writing this thesis, U.S District Judge Beryl Howell overturned the delisting of the gray wolf from the Endangered Species List in December 2014, citing the original delisting as “capricious and arbitrary” (Kramer 2014). His ruling placed the wolf back under protected status, thus making it illegal to kill wolves without just cause, such as immediate threats to humans or livestock (McKinney & Kennedy 2014). However, wolves are still vulnerable to delisting from the Endangered Species List because current scientific data from many wolf biologists and the Department of Natural Resources demonstrates that wolves continue to thrive in sustainable numbers in the Great Lakes region and will be not affected by state hunting quotas. Mech explains that the wolves of Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan are not considered endangered, and that “far more wolves are born each year than were being killed by hunters” (McKinney & Kennedy 2014). A Fish and Wildlife Services spokesperson states that ““We are disappointed by the Court’s decision. The science clearly shows that wolves are recovered in the Great Lakes region and we believe the Great Lakes states have clearly demonstrated their ability to effectively manage their wolf populations... This is a significant step backwards”” (Kramer 2014). While state-sanctioned wolf harvests are currently illegal, it is likely wolves will be delisted yet again in the future if scientific data continues to report sustainable and growing populations of wolves in the Great Lakes region. Thus, while opponents of the wolf hunts may consider the ruling a victory, Michigan is still vulnerable to future changes in legal policy.

However, wolves still continue to be threatened by illegal hunting each year even with formal protection, with exact numbers of killings per year difficult to determine.

Also, wolves are still subject to federal killings in suspected livestock predation, with approximately 200 wolves killed each year by officials in these cases (McKinney & Kennedy 2014). Farmers and ranchers are among the strongest proponents of the wolf hunts because of livestock loss from wolves. An interview of Minnesotan farmer Julian Brzoznowski from the *Star Tribune* reveals that federal officials have trapped around 200 wolves in fifteen years on his farm north of Orr, Minnesota, and he sued the federal government \$58,350 in 1976 for compensation he never received (Anderson 2012). In another interview with the *Star Tribune*, Brzoznowski says that the wolf's delisting is "a disgrace to common sense" because of its population stability in the region.

Hunting associations also are voicing their displeasure with the ruling, with Dennis Quarberg, the interim executive director of the Minnesota Deer Hunters Association stating that hunting wolves is "good for the species" and that their populations are healthy because hunters quickly filled the DNR's quota (McKinney & Kennedy 2014). In contrast, environmental organizations such as the Humane Society of the United States and the Center of Biological Diversity are pleased with the ruling, with both of them having sued the United States government over the delisting (Kramer 2014, McKinney & Kennedy 2014). Collette Adkins Giese argues that "We need healthy, core populations of wolves like we've got in the Great Lakes so wolves can disperse to other areas" (McKinney & Kennedy 2014). However, as long as livestock and encroaching suburbanization keep overlapping growing wolf territories, there will be conflict with wolves, whether it is from the predation of livestock or from the popular imagination's vision of wolves as bloodthirsty beasts.

While the scientific data on the current wolf populations in the Great Lakes may be scientifically sound, and their numbers may be sustainable enough for wolf hunting, this stance still reflects a western cultural view that wolves are resources, and not relatives. This idea originates from the idea of the interspecies hierarchy proposed by Aristotle as well, where the value of non-humans only extends to the usefulness they provide to humans. While modern scientific studies have acknowledged the roles of wolves and other species in the health of the greater environment, the stance of the Department of Natural Resources and other governmental and scientific organizations still reflect a heritage of western hierarchical models for approaching the environment. For example, the Department of Natural Resources has the term “resources” within its name, and the management of wolves and other non-human beings in the United States falls within this governmental department. By relating to non-humans as “resources,” the implication is that non-humans are exploitable objects existing for human use, including wolves. Thus, the primary indication of healthy wolf populations is numbers and quantifiable data, with emphasis on objective measurement rather than the proper relations humans establish with them.

The emphasis on quantifiable data, measurement, and objectivity in the western scientific tradition originated primarily during the Enlightenment era, with the theories of Bacon, Newton, and Locke “[asserting] that only information provided by measurement and experimentation could provide understanding of phenomena, which implied that science, as defined by the Western European intellectual tradition, was the only legitimate interpreter of the natural world” (Pierotti 1). However, in many forms of TEK, knowledge of natural world phenomena is obtained relationally, and “objectivity” has no

special significance. Rather, a type of “subjectivity” is given more importance, with how an individual relates to other beings and their reciprocal placement within the environment as orientations for interpreting environmental phenomena. Empirical analysis is only possible when such relationships are established, and “Indigenous traditions consider such reciprocal relationships as central to understanding the basis by which knowledge has been required through careful and detailed observation” (Pierotti 17). In this sense, a subjective approach is key to understanding the environment, with reciprocal relationships with wolves and other beings as components of the knowledge-creating process.

The stance that the DNR cannot consider “cultural arguments,” such as objections voiced by many Anishinaabeg, in regards to the wolf hunts is flawed because the objections and formal policies alike are all culturally derived. Here, legal policies cannot exist “objectively,” with their formation and execution a product of long western histories and ideologies, including hierarchical thinking and dominionism. European and western-derived scientific study is often applied hegemonically to indigenous lands, many times marginalizing local TEK in mainstream scientific circles. However, they both may inform the other, with mutual dialogue possible and desirable in resolving conflicts such as wolf hunting in the Great Lakes. In the case of the Great Lakes region, Anishinaabe knowledge is especially applicable in creating non-hierarchical ecological models, wherein the lives of wolves play an enormous part in the formation of environmental knowledge and behavior. In a Anishinaabe- and wolf-centered approach to the ecology of the Great Lakes, observations of wolf pack dynamics, as well as listening to the narratives and teachings of elder Anishinaabeg about wolves, yields the cultivation of

well-being and a healthy life—*bimaadiziwin*. If ecological models are to truly reflect the lands of study, not only would western scientific models be used but also local and indigenous cognitive models that incorporate the epistemes and ontologies of all the beings in a particular environment.

A *bimaadiziwin* and wolf-based model of academic study is full of numerous possibilities in application. Expanding conceptions of the natural environment from that of a collection of interrelated and empirical phenomena to that of a social environment, wolf ways of knowing and being can be integrated into mainstream study. Many biologists have noted the physical impacts of wolves on the environment, with the reintroduction of large carnivores as a way restore vegetation in disrupted ecosystems by regulating browsing ungulate populations (Ripple & Beschta 161). However, while subsistence relationships with other beings are well-noted in scientific studies, the study of achievement of mental and even spiritual health in human communities deriving from relationships with other beings has been neglected. Anishinaabe TEK emphasizes the establishment of relations with *bimaadiziwad*, or beings who “continue the state of being alive,” and “those who have power” (McNally 25). Arguably, wolves are *bimaadiziwad* in Anishinaabe lands, with wolf hunting not only an assault on ma’iingan but also on Anishinaabe communities. As *bimaadiziwad*, the preservation of the wolf is not strictly for conservation purposes, but also as a way for promoting the health and well-being for human communities. Beyond a binary of the wolf as either demonized or romanticized, humans owe much of their health and systems of knowledge and being to non-humans including wolves, which current studies of the Great Lakes must include to reflect a deeper understanding of ecology and social studies.

A large part of the wolf-hunting controversy lies among what are considered sources of well-being, health, and tradition. While ma'iinganag may be *bimaadiziwad* to the Anishinaabeg, it may be a threat to the well-being of Euro-Americans with a culture of long-standing animal husbandry practices. To a livestock owner, wolves can be a threat to their health and well-being and an assault to ancient interdependencies with livestock. To a hunter, banning wolf hunts may be seen as an assault of tradition, as expressed by Stan Meyer, a chairman of Montana's Fish, Wildlife and Parks Commission, declaring that "For me and for tens of thousands of Montanans hunting is not sport, it's not recreation, it's not business; a hunter is what I am. It's a part of my lifestyle; it's a part of my culture... When we feel that lifestyle is being threatened, that we're in the cusp of losing something of our heritage, something that causes us to live, we're scared" (Nie 57).

Mutual commonalities among traditional Anishinaabe attitudes towards wolves and largely non-Native farmers, ranchers, and hunters can be difficult to find in order to suggest practical solutions for the wolf-hunting conflict. Current wolf management outside of hunting is not effective in preventing all wolf predation on livestock. The use of wolf urine to mark property boundaries as difficult and expensive to obtain, and the use of large dogs to protect livestock, traditional in southern Europe, is only moderately effective but not completely so (Mech 100 2000c). Fencing may not keep out wolves, and ranchers often turn their livestock out onto unfenced public land to pasture (US Department of the Interior Bureau of Land Management), placing their livestock in more danger of predation because they can easily wander into wolf territories. The most effective policy concerning wolf management is governmental compensation in the

incident of livestock depredation; however, many ranchers and farmers cite the difficulties in bureaucratic paperwork and establishing a legitimate claim of a wolf kill to the government for compensation. The difficulties and delays of receiving governmental compensation money is one of the primary reasons why many wolves are illegally killed each year in the Great Lakes. However, a recent study conducted by Washington State University suggests that wolf harvests are counterproductive in keeping livestock mortality low, with a positive correlation in livestock predation increase as more wolves are hunted, most likely due to larger litter births as a result of increased hunting pressure (Wielgus & Peebles 1). This is similar to the largely unsuccessful elimination campaigns directed at coyotes (*Canis latrans*), with increased elimination resulting in larger litters and thus more widespread distribution and livestock predation (Knowlton et al 398). Counterintuitively, the less wolves are hunted, the more intact livestock populations may be, indicating that wolves may indeed be beneficial and fulfill the role of *bimaadiziwad* to farmers and ranchers.

A wolf-based epistemology and ontology may be a way to resolve the wolf-hunting controversy in the Great Lakes; or, at the very least, promote another approach to mutual dialogue about the issue. A wolf-based epistemology and ontology allows humans of the Great Lakes region to deconstruct hierarchical and linear ways of knowing and being in both popular culture and academic studies of the region, including Anishinaabe-centered and relational epistemologies and ontologies. With the deconstruction of an interspecies hierarchy and its replacement with a *bimaadiziwin* model, ecological crises in the Great Lakes and beyond may be addressed in a more inclusive manner, incorporating the systems of knowledge of all local beings and not just western

hegemonic systems of knowledge. Assuming that the only valid models of ecological knowledge are western-derived is a result of dominionism in an intellectual sense, where global dominionism also affects the mental and paradigmatic aspects of human life. In the context of ecology and the humanities, to acknowledge indigenous existing systems of knowledge in a given area is not only respectful, but also necessary for the lives of all the beings in that environment for survival and well-being.

The concept of *bimaadiziwin* in environmental and social theory brings another method to the table in the deconstruction of the epistemic binary between that of human and non-human animal, and also to the decolonization of land and mind in the Great Lakes region. Colonization affects entire mental, social, and environmental spheres, with the wolf-hunting conflict an example of how individual pastimes and governmental institutions alike attempt to exercise dominion over indigenous intellectual property and ways of being. By centering on ma'iingan in the Great Lakes, Anishinaabe knowledge brings itself back to the center as well and subverts European ideals as the center of North American land. A *bimaadiziwin* framework acknowledges that all beings, including non-humans, can contribute to the health and well-being of both humans and other than human persons, and that establishing relationships with non-human beings leads one to become human, a proper human. Ma'iingan is one of the many important *bimaadiziwad*, and in an Anishinaabe-centered ecology, establishing relationships with wolves and the surrounding environment one learns proper behavior social behavior and thus can achieve *bimaadiziwin*. A wolf-centered epistemology and ontology acknowledges humanness and “self” as relational, and not as a solely individual or even human enterprise. By observing the ways of knowing and being from non-humans, humans, both Anishinaabe and non-

Anishinaabe, may more easily incorporate a *bimaadiziwin* framework into their knowledge systems, thereby recognizing the importance of Anishinaabe and non-human ways of being in the overall communities of the Great Lakes.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alessa (Na'ia), L. "What is Truth? Where Western Science and Traditional Knowledge Converge." In *The Alaska Native Reader: History, Culture, Politics*, edited by. M. Williams, M (Shaa Tl'aa). Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 2009.
- Anderson, Dennis. "Cattlemen Figures Wolf Hunt Won't Work." *Star Tribune*. February 1, 2012. <http://m.startribune.com/sports/outdoors/138263784.html>.
- Aybes, C. and D.W. Yalden. "Place-Name Evidence for the Former Distribution and Status of Wolves and Beavers in Britain. *Mammal Review* 25 (1995): 201–226. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2907.1995.tb00444.x.
- Barnouw, Victor. *Wisconsin Chippewa Myths & Tales and Their Relation to Chippewa Life*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1977.
- Benton-Banai, Edward. *The Mishomis Book: The Voice of the Ojibway*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2010.
- Berkes, Fikret. *Sacred Ecology*. New York: Routledge, 2012.
- Black-Rogers, Mary. "Ojibwa Power Belief System." In *The Anthropology of Power*, edited by R.D. Fogelson and R.N. Adams, 141-51. New York: Academic Press, 1977.
- Bohaker, Heidi. "Nindoodemag: The Significance of Algonquian Kinship Networks in the Eastern Great Lakes Region, 1600-1701" *The William and Mary Quarterly* 63 (2006): 23-52.
- Boitani, Luigi. "Ecological and Cultural Diversities in the Evolution of Wolf-Human Relationships." In *Ecology and Conservation of Wolves in a Changing World*, edited by L.N. Carbyn, S.H. Fritts, and D.R. Seip, 3-12. Edmonton: Canadian Circumpolar Institute, 1995.
- Broker, Ignatia. *Night Flying Woman: An Ojibway Narrative*. Saint Paul: Minnesota Historical Society Press, 1983.
- Carroll, Clint. "Minnesota Wolf Policy Should Include Ojibwe Perspective." *Star Tribune*, March 13 2013. <http://www.startribune.com/opinion/commentaries/197677461.html>.
- Classen, Constance. "Foundations for an Anthropology of the Senses." *International Social Sciences Journal*, 49 (1997): 401-412. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2451.1997.tb00032.x.
- Coleman, Jon T. *Vicious: Wolves and Men in America*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 2004.

- Davenport, Frances Gardiner, ed. *European Treaties Bearing on the History of the United States and Its Dependencies to 1648*. Washington, DC: Carnegie Institute of Washington, 1917.
- Dunning R.W. *Social and Economic Change Among the Northern Ojibwa*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1959.
- Ellis, William, trans. *Politics: A Treatise of Government*. London: J.M Dent & Sons, 1935.
- Fellenz, Marc R. *The Moral Menagerie: Philosophy and Animal Rights*. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 2007.
- Hallowell, A. Irving. *Culture and Experience*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1955.
- Hallowell, A. Irving. *Ojibwa Ontology, Behavior, and Worldview*. Columbia University Press, 1964.
- Hermes, Mary. “Ma’iingan Is Just A Misspelling of the Word Wolf:’ A Case for Teaching Culture Through Language.” *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 36 (2005): 43-56. <http://www.jstor.org/stable3651308>.
- Hosmer, James, ed. *Winthrop’s Journal*, Vol. 1. New York: Scriber’s, 1908.
- Minnesota Department of Natural Resources. “Hunting Land Locations.” <http://www.dnr.state.mn.us/hunting/tips/locations.html>. DOA: Oct 13 2013.
- \_\_\_ “Minnesota Department of Natural Resources Wolf Briefing.” January 5, 2012.
- \_\_\_ “Minnesota Wolf Management Plan.” February 2001.
- Jennings, Francis. *Invasion of America: Indians, Colonialism, and the Cant of Conquest*. New York: W.W. Horton, 1976.
- Johnston, Basil. *Honour Earth Mother*. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 2003.
- \_\_\_ *Ojibway Heritage*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1976.
- \_\_\_ *The Manitous: The Spiritual World of the Ojibway*. New York: Harper Collins Publishers, 1995.
- Jones, Karen. “Fighting Outlaws, Returning Wolves.” *History Today*, 52 (2002): 38-40.
- Knowlton, Frederick F., Eric M. Gese, and Michael M. Jaeger. “Coyote Depredation Control: An Interface Between Biology and Management.” *Journal of Range Management* 52 (1999): 398-412. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4003765>.
- Kormornicka, Jolanta N. “Man as Rabid Beast: Criminals into Animals in Late Medieval France.” *French History* 28 (2014).

- Kraker, Dan. "Ojibwe Bands Ban Wolf Hunting—But Only on Indian-Controlled Lands." *Minnesota Public Radio*, October 31 2012. <http://minnesota.publicradio.org/display/web/2012/10/31/environment/ojibwe-ban-wolf-hunting>.
- Kramer, Gary. "Federal Court Puts Gray Wolf Back on Endangered Species List." *CBS News*. Dec 19 2014. <http://www.cbsnews.com/news/federal-court-rejects-obama-decision-to-delist-great-lakes-wolf-popuation/>.
- Landes, Ruth. *Ojibwa sociology*. New York: Columbia University, 1937.
- Leopold, Aldo. *A Sand County Almanac*. New York: Ballantine, 1949.
- Mather, Cotton. *Little Flocks Guarded Against Grievous Wolves*. Boston: Benjamin Ellis and John Allen, 1691.
- McNamee, Thomas. *The Return of the Wolf to Yellowstone*. New York: Henry Holt, 1998.
- McKinney, Matt and Tony Kennedy. "Federal Judge Rules Gray Wolf Hunt Illegal, Places Animal Back on Endangered Species List." *Star Tribune*, Dec 19 2014. <http://www.startribune.com/local/286428621.html>.
- McNally, Michael D. *Honoring Elders: Aging, Authority, and Ojibwe Religion*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2009.
- Mech, L. David. "Alpha Status, Dominance, and Division of Labor in Wolf Packs." *Canadian Journal of Zoology* 77 (1999). Jamestown. ND: Northern Prairie Wildlife Research Center Home Page. <http://www.npwr.usgs.gov/resource/2000/alstat/alstat.htm>.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Leadership in Wolf, *Canis lupus*, Packs. *Canadian Field Naturalist* 114 (2000): 259-263.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Minnesota Wolf." In *The Wolves of Minnesota: Howl in the Heartland*, edited by L. David Mech, 51-59. Stillwater, Minnesota: Voyageur Press Inc., 2000.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Wolf Management in Minnesota." In *The Wolves of Minnesota: Howl in the Heartland*, edited by L. David Mech, 91-104. Stillwater, Minnesota: Voyageur Press Inc., 2000.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Wolf Numbers and Reproduction." In *The Wolves of Minnesota: Howl in the Heartland*, edited by L. David Mech, 73-81. Stillwater, Minnesota: Voyageur Press Inc., 2000.
- Mech, L. David and Boitani, Luigi. "Wolf Social Ecology." In *Wolves: Behavior, Ecology, and Conservation*, edited by L. David Mech and Luigi Boitani, 1-34. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003.

- Miller, Cary. *Ogimaag: Anishinaabeg Leadership, 1760-1845*. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 2010.
- Miller, J.R. *Shingwauk's Vision: A History of Native Residential Schools*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996.
- Morton, Nathaniel. *New England's Memoriall 1668*. Boston: Club of Odd Volumes, 1903.
- Newcomb, Steven T. *Pagans in the Promised Land*. Golden, CO: Fulcrum Publishing, 2008.
- Nie, Martin A. *Beyond Wolves: The Politics of Wolf Recovery and Management*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2003.
- Nieaber, Georgianne. "Minnesota Wolf Hunt Desecrates Ojibwe Creation Symbol." *Huffington Post*, November 11 2012. [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/georgianne-nienaber/minnesota-wolf-hunting\\_b\\_2112944.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/georgianne-nienaber/minnesota-wolf-hunting_b_2112944.html).
- Packard, Jane M. "Wolf Behavior: Reproductive, Social, and Intelligent." In *Wolves: Behavior, Ecology, and Conservation*, edited by L. David Mech and Luigi Boitani, 35-65. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2003.
- Peacock, Thomas and Wisuri, Marlene. *Ojibwe Waasa Inaabidaa: We Look In All Directions*. Afton, Minnesota: Afton Historical Society Press, 2002.
- Pierotti, Raymond. *Indigenous Knowledge, Ecology, and Evolutionary Biology*. New York, Routledge, 2011.
- Pluskowski, Aleksander G. "The Wolf." In *Extinctions and Invasions: A Social History of British Fauna*, edited by Terry O'Connor, and Naomi Sykes, 68-74. Oxford: Windgater Press, 2010.
- Ripple, William J. and Beschta, Robert L. "Wolves, Elk, Willows, and Trophic Cascades in the Upper Gallatin Range of Southwestern Montana, USA." *Forest Ecology and Management* 200 (2004): 161-181. doi:10.1016/j.foreco.2004.06.017.
- Robertson, Tom. "Some Ojibwe Tribal Members Object to Wolf Hunting, Trapping." *Minnesota Public Radio*, March 13, 2012. <http://minnesota.publicradio.org/display/web/2012/03/13/ojibwe-opposition-wolf-hunting>.
- Rogers, Edward S. *Round Lake Ojibwa*. Occasional Paper 5, Art and Archaeology Division. Toronto: Royal Ontario Museum, 1962.
- Ross, Rupert. *Dancing with a Ghost: Exploring Aboriginal Reality*. Toronto: Penguin Group, 2006.

- Schoolcraft, Henry R. *The Myth of Hiawatha and Other Oral Legends, Mythologic and Allegoric of the North American Indians*. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippencott & Co., 1856.
- State of Minnesota In Court of Appeals. Court File No. A12-1680. Center for Biological Diversity, Howling for Wolves, Petitioners, vs. Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, and Tom Landwehr. September 28, 2012.
- Stoddard, Rev. Solomon. Letter to Gov. Joseph Dudley, October 22, 1703. *New England Historical and Genealogical Register* 24, 1870.
- Sturleson, Snorri. Translated by Henry Adams Bellows. *The Poetic Edda*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1936.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Translated by Jean I. Young. *The Prose Edda*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1966.
- U.S. Department of the Interior Bureau of Land Management, Colorado. "Fencing Your Home on the Range."  
<http://www.blm.gov/co/st/en/fo/crvfo/grazing/Fencing.html>.
- Vannote, Vance. *Women of White Earth*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999.
- Warren, William W. *History of the Ojibway People*. Edited by Theresa Schneck. St. Paul, Minnesota: Minnesota Historical Society Press, 2009.
- Wielgus, Robert B. and Kaylie A. Peebles (2014). "Effects of Wolf Mortality on Livestock Depredations". *PLoS ONE* 9(12): e113505. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0113505.
- Wilson, Charles J. "Could We Live with Reintroduced Carnivores in the UK?" *Mammal* 34 (2004): 211-232.