

Recently an experienced back packer was killed by a grizzly bear in the Kluane National park in the Yukon Territory in Canada. According to Gary Shelton, a wilderness expert in the area who teaches people who work in the forest how to survive bear attacks, the bear attack rate has increased 25% since 1990. He believes there are two reasons for this --first, more bears, owing to Park policies restricting the number of bears allowed to be killed, and second, less fear by bears of people in the park. Gun lobbyists have cited the back packer's death in support of permitting visitors in the park to carry guns. Conservationists contend that both brown bears and, especially, grizzlies would become seriously endangered species *if more* killing of bears were allowed. In this connection they note that the grizzly bears in Western and Northern Canada have the lowest reproduction rate of any mammals in North America. The conservationists want a complete ban on killing bears in the park.

Should the policy be changed to allow more killing of bears? If so, why? If not, why not?

Questions for the IIT Ethics Bowl (October 19, 1996)

© Robert Ladenson, Illinois Institute of Technology