THE HISTORICAL ANIMAL

EDITED BY SUSAN NANCE

SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Copyright © 2015 by Syracuse University Press
Syracuse, New York 13244-5290
All Rights Reserved

First Edition 2015
15 16 17 18 19 20 6 5 4 3 2 1

∞ The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of the American National Standard for Information Sciences—Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48-1992.

For a listing of books published and distributed by Syracuse University Press, visit www.SyracuseUniversityPress.syr.edu.

ISBN: 978-0-8156-3428-7 (cloth)
978-0-8156-3406-5 (paperback)
978-0-8156-5339-4 (e-book)

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

The historical animal / edited by Susan Nance. — First edition.
pages cm
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 978-0-8156-3428-7 (cloth : alk. paper) —
ISBN 978-0-8156-3406-5 (pbk. : alk. paper) — ISBN 978-0-8156-5339-4 (e-book)
1. Human-animal relationships—History. 2. Animals—Social aspects—History. I. Nance, Susan.
QL85.H565 2015
590—dc23 2015021627

Manufactured in the United States of America

Contents

10

Migrant Muskoxen and the Naturalization of National Identity in Scandinavia

Dolly Jørgensen

In the realm of historical studies, human migrations, whether forced or deliberately chosen, have become a standard area of inquiry. Scholarship in journals such as *International Migration* and *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* has brought human migration and its consequences to the fore, particularly to question and refine international immigration policies. Social scientists including demographers, economists, sociologists, and political scientists, along with social and political historians, have been involved in this field. Human migration is implicitly understood when a book titled *Migration in World History* is seen on the shelf.[1] On the other hand, animal migrations, whether by the choice of the individual animals or forced upon them, have been relegated to the realm of the natural sciences, where animal movements are modeled and predicted. Within the biological sciences, migration is understood as an adaptation to resources that leads to mobile animal populations.[2]

In this chapter, I want to show that a humanistic inquiry into animal migration is a possible and fruitful way of understanding how human and animal histories intersect. Rather than thinking only about migration in the biological sense, I apply the broader focus of human migration studies to any kind of nonhuman animal movement over political borders in order to find a fuller explanation for causes and effects. While there is historical research on the

classification of animal species as native, non-native, exotic, and alien, the inquiry has not previously been framed as a story analogous to human migrations.[3] A migration perspective opens up the possibility of identifying as forced migration those animal movements that involve translocations of individuals who are captured in the wild and then taken to another location for release.[4] A migration approach also gives agency to animals who choose to move over human-made political boundaries, borders which they neither know nor care about, as they seek greener pastures to survive, just as humans migrate for both push (fleeing oppression) and pull (better living condition prospects) reasons. Thinking about the interaction of animal immigrants and current inhabitants allows us to see the challenges of social integration for the newcomers. Focusing on particular animals moving or being moved avoids the trap of the natural sciences that study movement only on the level of whole species, which can obfuscate what happens to the individual. In this paper, I use the case of muskoxen who were relocated from Greenland to Scandinavia in the early twentieth century to argue that nonhuman migrants, like human ones, are legitimate individuals who face challenges in the process of migration.

In this tale of muskoxen on the move, the species characteristics and natural history matter. The muskox (*Ovibos moschatus*) is probably the worst named animal on the planet: muskoxen do not have musk, nor are they oxen. The species are ruminants in the same family as sheep and goats, although their propensity to charge using their solid, thick horns when threatened led to their association with oxen, while their strong smell reminded early explorers of musk. The muskox has a thick coat of underwool, called qiviut, which is particularly warm and water-resistant and is shed in the summertime. Muskoxen inhabit the arctic and subarctic tundra, eating grasses, lichens, mosses, and other plants. They are generally sedentary during the winter months, when they conserve energy and dig for foliage under shallow snow. Fossil evidence shows that during the Pleistocene period (which ended about 11,000 years ago) their range was circumpolar, and included present-day Scandinavia. In

the nineteenth century, muskox populations were restricted to arctic Canada and Greenland.[5]

The limited geographical spread of muskoxen was to radically change in the course of the twentieth century, as individuals were forcibly relocated and then the growing population spread out in their new landscapes. The course of these migrations will be examined in three parts: the first capture of muskoxen in Greenland for relocation to Scandinavia; the development of conflicts between the new muskox residents and human residents in Norway; and the self-migration of a group of muskoxen from Norway to Sweden.

Moving Unwilling Muskox

In 1899, the Swedish geologist Alfred Gabriel Nathorst led an expedition to Greenland. According to his book recording his adventures, Nathorst observed wild muskox herds during the expedition and came to the conclusion that the Swedes should try to import and domesticate the animals. The main purpose of such an endeavor would be to corner the market on muskox wool, which is considered one of the highest quality wools available. He believed that the muskox would acclimatize perfectly to Sweden and be even more productive than reindeer, which were herded as semi-wild domesticates. Nathorst was insistent on the worthiness of the cause: "They [muskoxen] are not kept here as a curiosity, but are to be domesticated, for the benefit of our descendants. One may seriously hope that the experiment will succeed."[6]

Nathorst's proposal fit in well with the rise of the acclimatization movement and associated societies in the second half of the nineteenth century.[7] Acclimatization, the intentional movement of animals, birds, fish, and plants for the benefit of humans, took place within the nineteenth century colonial context that witnessed European nations spreading their settlers across the globe, particularly in Africa and southeast Asia. France boasted the first acclimatization society, founded in 1854, and likeminded groups sprang up throughout the major European powers and their colonies. There were nationalist and imperialist notions behind many of the projects, aimed at aesthetic beautification, hunting opportunities, and agricultural improvement, whether it was introducing songbirds in America as a way of making it more aesthetically British or moving camels to Australia to make the deserts accessible. While the groups often looked to introduce species from their homeland into colonies as a mode of colonial development, some species were moved outside of that paradigm: from colony to homeland. The muskox domestication proposal latched on to acclimatization sentiments, which saw nature as a bounty simply waiting to be harvested for the benefit of the country.

The year after Nathorst's adventure, the zoologist Gustaf Kolthoff led a Swedish expedition to northeast Greenland, sponsored by the mining magnate Gustaf E. Broms. The tasks included bringing back specimens for the new Biologiska museet (Biological Museum) in Stockholm, and capturing living muskoxen, as suggested by Nathorst, who had championed the cause of bringing back muskoxen for domestication in Sweden.

While bringing back a live muskox to Sweden had sounded like a straightforward idea, capturing live calves was no easy task. A muskox has a prominent horn plate that spans its forehead and extends in forward-pointing horns in both sexes. When threatened, a herd will form a circle with the calves in the middle. From this position, a dominant adult will often charge the perceived threat at a shockingly fast speed with horns down like a charging bull. This habit is believed to have developed as a defense mechanism against wolf predation, the main nonhuman threat to muskoxen. Kolthoff's expedition soon discovered that the calves could not easily be separated from the adults because of the herding and charging behaviors. Kolthoff decided that the only way to catch the youngsters was to kill the adults in the herd first.[8]

Kolthoff graphically recorded the expedition's attempts at capturing the calves, which included shooting the adults. In several cases,

the slaughter resulted in no calves caught. A long translated passage from Kolthoff is worth considering:

> In the company of Ostergren, Levin, Kjell, and some of my most hearty men, I rowed then ashore, where we went around the animals and approached them so that they found themselves between us and the sea. As soon as they became aware of us, they stood immediately in a protective ring, and calves took their place among the elderly. So the magnificent animals lowered their heads threatening to turn against us, and when we reached them at good shooting range, I asked Kjell to shoot first. He hit a bull in the forehead, who fell instantly. At that moment I shot one, and a third went to Levin's shot. Now the other animals took to flight, but in that instant a big bull got a bullet from my second gun, with the result that he drove his horns into the ground, did a somersault and tumbled dead near the embankment down to the beach. Only two cows escaped, in the company of the calves.
>
> I now switched out the double paradox rifle with the *mauser-studsaren* and thus brought down one cow, while Kjell shot down the other. The calves then stopped and became encircled by us, and I was sure to catch them, then unfortunately one of the men became too eager and rushed at them, with the result that the already quite calm calves broke out through our line and fled to the mountains.[9]

This scene was repeated several times before the expedition successfully captured a male calf, which was named Hjalmar in honor of expedition member Hjalmar Östergren, and a female calf, named Lotta after Kolthoff's wife Charlotte. They were taken to Broms's estate near Boden in northern Sweden.

Nathorst was disappointed that only two animals had been brought back, so when he heard that four calves had been captured by a Norwegian and were for sale in Tromsø, he asked the industrialist and active supporter of the Biologiska museet Karl Fredrik Liljevalch Jr. to buy them. Liljevalch did so, and brought the four calves—two male and two females—to his estate Medstugan in Jämtland. One of

the males died soon afterward from a pelvic injury sustained either during capture or transport.[10]

Although Nathorst had predicted that muskox calves would be easily domesticated if around humans early on, events would prove otherwise. According to Henrik Persson, who worked for Liljevalch when the muskoxen were brought to Medstugan, the animals were uncooperative—they were difficult to herd and one of the males was consistently charging Henrik's father, Per.[11] The individuals did not fare well. Lotta, the female from the Kolthoff expedition, soon died, and Hjalmar was brought to join the Liljevach herd. They lived in a half-hectare pen and were fed on Timothy-grass (used as cattle fodder), rutabaga, and carrots. By 1904, they had all died from illness or injury.[12]

The violence against and ripping apart of the muskox herds on East Greenland would continue for the next sixty-nine years. Norwegian and Danish expeditions continued to shoot the adult animals in a herd in order to extract live calves.[13] At least 290 live calves were brought to Norway between 1899 and 1969; of the total, seventy were used in domestication projects, seventy-five were set free in the wild, and the rest either were sold to zoos or died before they could be sold. In addition, about fifty muskox calves were taken out of East Greenland and shipped directly to other countries without going through Norway.[14] According to estimates by Norwegian hunters that three to four adults had to be killed for each calf caught, an estimate of 1,200 adults slain during these activities is not unreasonable.[15]

Kolthoff justified the slaughter in order to capture the live calves using the rationale of its future economic benefit to the Swedish nation: "Surely two muskox calves in Sweden are much more valuable than six in Greenland."[16] The place where the muskoxen lived affected their value to humans—acclimatized muskoxen in Sweden were worth more to humans than free-roaming animals with no direct economic value in Greenland. The forced migration of muskoxen in the name of nationalism carried a consequence for the animals, who, if they survived the slaughter, were forcibly removed to

distant lands and released into newly constructed herds of all young animals, a family situation radically different from the wild.

A Dangerous Immigrant

Value to the country likewise motivated the reintroduction of the muskox in Norway. The reasons why Adolf Hoel, the founder of the Norges Svalbard- og Ishavsundersøkelser (which would later become the Norwegian Polar Institute) and instigator of the Norwegian muskox releases, decided to import the animal in the late 1920s are complex. The practical reason was to establish a new meat-producing animal in the country, especially one that would provide an important meat resource for seal hunters on Svalbard, an arctic island which had been claimed by Norway as a territory. In some publications, the production of muskox wool is also mentioned as a potential product.

On a political level, Hoel believed the importation would help Norway's international reputation. Strong international criticisms of Norwegian seal and whale hunting practices in East Greenland had recently been raised, particularly coming from Denmark, which claimed the rest of Greenland. One of the major complaints was that hunters were unnecessarily slaughtering muskoxen—both leaving carcasses to rot and feeding good meat to sled dogs—and these practices were threatening the muskox with extinction on Greenland. A group of Scandinavian natural scientists requested that muskoxen be given international protected status in East Greenland; to them, the animal had intrinsic value that should not be violated through overhunting that would lead to extinction. Hoel set the relocation of muskoxen to Norway within this species conservation framework, writing that "there is no doubt that the transfer of this species to Svalbard is a measure that will improve international public opinion of our hunting practices."[17] By establishing a new population of muskox on Svalbard, Hoel believed that Norway would be re-envisioned as a conservation nation instead of a destructive one: "We will show with [the muskox transplantation] that we don't only slaughter, but

that we too support cross-border idealistic cultural work."[18] The project thus "had a national importance for us [Norwegians]."[19] Within this nationalistic context, a total seventeen calves were released on the island of Svalbard (at the time a Norwegian territory, now part of Norway proper) and thirty-nine were set out in the Dovre Mountains in central Norway between 1929 and 1953.

Not only were the muskox moved to Norway not asked if they wanted to be relocated, but the local residents were also not asked if they wanted muskoxen in their backyards. The Dovre area is a large inland mountainous region in central Norway on the main south–north route from Oslo to Trondheim with its highest mountain, Snøhetta, rising to 2,286 meters above sea level and is snow-capped all year long. The mountains are a popular trekking destination for both day hikes and longer camping trips. Small farms and villages are located all along the region's valleys, with livestock grazing down in the valleys during cold months and up on the higher mountain pastures during the summer.

An author listed as only Nicolette published a poem in the Norwegian newspaper *Aftenposten* on October 24, 1932, only two weeks after the first release of muskox calves in the Dovre area. In her four-stanza poem, Nicolette says that she has been a regular hiker in the Dovre Mountains and one of the imminent dangers has always been cattle bulls allowed to graze freely. Now she has "heard with a shock that the danger steadily increases. Now someone has let loose a flock of wild muskoxen." With "muskox in front and muskox behind" there is a danger. "Think," she writes, "about when a tourist comes carefully creeping! And think when all the bulls in the mountains come into rut!" Nicolette writes that she had decided that she would no longer trek in the Dovre Mountains because the danger was too great: "But think about a boxing match with that kind of muskox ruffian."[20] In the poem, Nicolette places her anxiety and feeling of loss within Norway's very strong "right to roam" (*allemannsrett*) tradition in which walkers and hikers are permitted to cross property as long as they do no damage. She hints at a conflict that would slowly simmer for the next thirty years, between the rights of the

muskoxen as immigrants to Dovre to roam free and the rights of locals and tourists to use the land freely.

The project leaders tried over and over again to downplay the danger from a muskox. For example, the secondary headline of an *Aftenposten* article on October 10, 1932, announcing the release of the muskoxen, states: "They are not a danger for mountain hikers."[21] In a 1933 feature article about the Dovre muskoxen, the writer acknowledged that "Are muskoxen dangerous?" was a common question. The answer was that while they certainly threaten hunters on Greenland, particularly if the hunters have dogs, no one has ever been killed by one. The conclusion was that "tourists have nothing to fear, if they don't tease the animals."[22]

In spite of statements to the contrary, muskoxen in Dovre did prove themselves to be dangerous on occasion. In 1954, a family going into the mountains to pick flowers saw a herd of muskoxen with calves and decided to approach them to take pictures. They got within thirty meters before one charged them. No one was injured, but an action photo of a muskox running toward the camera showed it must have been a pretty scary experience.[23] In September 1963, a man tried to photograph a lone muskox that had wandered into the village of Soknedal and got thrown up in the air by the muskox's horns. That animal had been around the village several days and had been roped on one foot and stones had been thrown at it, so it was likely very tired of being bothered.[24] Later that same month, another local man tried to take a photograph of a muskox that had made its way into Tolga, higher up in the mountains. He supposedly got within fifteen meters before the animal charged. Although the photographer was knocked down, he was able to recover his camera and take a picture of the muskox standing below two of his comrades up a tree.[25]

In all of these incidents, people had approached the muskox to either photograph it or observe it, often getting ridiculously close to them. Muskoxen are generally calm animals, but they attack when they feel threatened, which is what getting close to them does. These animals were not attacking people randomly; they were attacking people that they thought were attacking them. Consistently in the newspaper reports, authorities stressed that the muskox were not dangerous if people kept their distance.[26]

The muskox–human conflict culminated on Wednesday, July 22, 1964, when 74-year-old Ola Stølen noticed a muskox near his farm in Stølen, a little hamlet in a valley of the Dovre Mountains of Norway. He told three other family members about the visitor. The group of three men and one woman wanted to observe the seldom-seen animal close-up, so they crept up to within forty meters and stood still, observing the animal for ten minutes. After a while, the muskox began to snort and then charged the group. Ola was knocked down as the three younger adults quickly ran back to the house. When Ola got up, he grabbed a stone to try to scare away the animal, but the muskox charged again and this time gave Ola a life-ending blow to the chest.[27]

Witnesses called the sheriff, who then contacted the regional muskox manager, John Angard in Dombås, and asked if they could kill the bull.[28] Angard said he would come to take care of it, but before he could get there, the local sheriff and another man shot the animal dead.

The local inhabitants were outraged at Ola's death. On August 5, a telegram signed by 122 people was sent with an ultimatum to the Ministry of Agriculture (Landbruksdepartmentet), which had imported the muskox herd:

> The undersigned, all residents of Engan, Oppdal, want to make the Ministry of Agriculture aware that the tragic event Wednesday, 22 July, when Ola Stølen was killed by a muskox on his property, has created deep unease among folks here. We are therefore bold enough to ask the Ministry to make sure all muskox are removed from the valley between Amotseiven and Driva by Monday, 24 August 1964. After this date, all muskox which are found in the said area will be shot. We hope and believe you will understand our reaction.[29]

According to interviews in the papers, the deadline was picked because it was the first day of school. Children were scared to walk

the three to four kilometers through the forest to school, especially since it would be dark both before and after school by late fall. Women interviewed didn't want to leave the farm alone for fear of muskox.[30]

The response by the local community of Engan to Ola Stølan's death was focused on the muskox. No one from the local community said anything about the human behavior that had led to the incident; it was the muskox that needed to be removed. The spokesperson for the protest group, Olav Vammervold, was quoted in the paper as saying,

> We up here live in a pact with nature, and we obviously don't have anything against muskox, in the same way that we don't mind any other animals. But as long as they can't keep themselves within a particular area, they must be removed.[31]

This pact with nature was clearly not a two-way deal: it was people who set the terms of the contract, and animals needed to obey the human rules. Vammervold's statement attributes complete agency to the muskoxen—they move and roam and are expected to respect boundaries, although these are boundaries that they have no way of knowing. This mode of "placing" animals in fixed, discrete spaces, even if those spaces are mentally constructed rather than physically delineated with fences, serves to define animals that move outside of that zone as transgressors.[32]

On August 28, the Ministry of Agriculture issued an official response to the Oppdal sheriff in response to the threat to kill muskox in the Dovre area. The Ministry decided that muskoxen were protected legally as protected large wildlife according to the law, which meant that the animals could not just be killed but that a license could be issued to take down a specific muskox who was threatening people.[33] The problem was that the muskoxen were no longer "supervised" by anyone. The Norwegian Polar Institute, which had first imported the animals, disavowed responsibility for them.[34] The Ministry's position was that "the State and the Ministry have no special ownership of these animals, and they have not been able to find any basis in law which gives the Ministry the right to issue hunting permits."[35] The local populace complained about this lack of responsibility for an "imported" animal that had shown considerable autonomy since arriving in Norway.[36]

Although muskox conflicts continued to arise, especially when lone males showed up in towns or when would-be photographers got too close to a muskox in the mountains, there were no more generic outcries to extinguish the population in the Dovre region. By 1964, muskoxen had become naturalized—they were no longer simple scientific or agricultural objects, but instead, wildlife protected by the same big game restrictions as other fauna. People seem to have acclimated to the presence of muskoxen, and the muskox in return had become an accepted part of Norwegian nature.[37]

Crossing Boundaries

On the first of September 1971, the regional Swedish newspaper Östersunds-Posten warned their readers on the first page: "Wild muskoxen in Härjedalen. Warning: They can attack!" Seven muskoxen (a group of five plus two lone older animals) from the Dovre mountain area had been spotted near the Norwegian–Swedish border in the mountains near Funäsdalen, and they appeared to be headed to pasture on the Swedish side.[38] The papers continued to cover each sighting of, or failure to sight, the muskoxen over the next week.

The local tourist industry in the area quickly grabbed onto the muskox as a potential draw. On September 3, the Hamrafjället tourist hotel was already advertising its first expedition to "Muskoxen's land" (Myskoxarnas land) to take place the next morning. A Norwegian tourist staying at the hotel scoffed at the offer saying, "It is Dovre which is 'Muskoxen's land.'" Norway would no longer have sole claim to the animals; if the herd did settle in Härjedalen, they would be exploited to draw in tourists.[39] The potential for the herd to stay in Sweden was written about with anticipation. In phrases like "if we get to keep these rare animals in the Swedish mountains,"

there was a clear longing to have the muskox come and stay.[40] A local newspaper article called the animals a "world sensation" adding that "such a tourist attraction is something one could not even have dreamed of."[41]

From the herd's perspective, there was no boundary to cross. There are no fences or markers in the mountains that divide Norway and Sweden. The Swedish area they were headed for was "very ideal from their perspective" as a grazing grounds.[42] At the time of the crossing, the Norwegian Directorate for Hunting, Wildlife Conservation, and Freshwater Fish was responsible for monitoring the Dovre muskox population. They decided that there was no action to take to get the muskoxen to return to the Dovre area, since wildlife normally crossed the national boundaries; according to the head of the Directorate's Trondheim office it was "standard practice that the government does not interfere in animals' natural migrations."[43] This had indeed been the standard practice for semi-domesticated reindeer, which migrate annually across the border, so extending this policy to muskoxen seemed unproblematic. The Swedish government also did not act to remove the animals.

The animals stayed in the border mountains, migrating back and forth over the national boundaries regularly. From the perspective of many Swedes living in the Funäsdalen area, this herd was "Swedish." Muskox quickly became understood as a central element in the mountains, probably because of its novelty and distinctive appearance. When a national postage stamp series titled "Sweden's Mountains" was issued in March 1984, the three images chosen were the angelica flowering plant, the lemming, and the muskox. The text printed (in both Swedish and English) with the first-day issue is telling of the rapid integration of the muskox: "In 1971 the musk-ox (*Ovibos moschatus*) came back to the Swedish fauna. The occasion can be seen as a return to the fold, and today there are some 30 animals in the province Härjedalen."[44] This human inclusion of muskox in the Swedish fauna came only thirteen years after the herd had immigrated over the border.

Although the herd size had boomed in the early 1980s—there was even talk about relocating sub-herds to various other areas in Sweden—the population crashed in the late 1980s for unknown reasons, although a livestock disease is suspected. Some Härjedalen locals, as well as the Swedish Green Party (Miljöpartiet), which had been founded in 1981 and was an active promoter of animal rights and nature conservation in Parliament, wanted national action to boost the muskox population. A parliamentary motion was filed in 1990 by four Green Party members requesting an investigation into potential ways to help the muskoxen in Härjedalen, arguing that because paleoarcheological finds of muskoxen had been made in Sweden, "the species belongs truly to Sweden's original inhabitants. . . . We have no right to abandon the muskox."[45] The official response to the motion reveals that everyone was not in agreement about the muskox's "naturalization": the Parliamentary statement "Swedish Environmental Politics," issued in 1991, addressed the motion, claiming that while the animals had value in the tourism sector, "muskoxen have been extinct for such a long time in Scandinavia that they can no longer be seen as a part of our natural fauna."[46]

The muskoxen who had migrated on their own from Norway to Sweden had caused this debate about their status. The tension between those who saw the muskox as a "natural" part of the national fauna and those who did not continued unresolved. A parliamentary motion made in 2000, as well as a draft Threatened Species Action Plan for the muskox, were both denied.[47] The muskox thus does not have a conservation plan in force in Sweden, and the species is not recognized as eligible for listing as an endangered species in Sweden because it is classified as "introduced."[48] Yet, a local handling plan for muskoxen was established in 2002 as part of a European Union (EU) project: "Framtidsfjäll 2000" targeted nature and tourism improvement in the Funäsdal mountain area. This plan included short- and long-term actions to increase the muskox population, including a suggestion to translocate more individuals into the herd to strengthen it.[49] This suggestion has become reality with

the establishment of a muskox breeding center (Myskoxcentrum) in Tännäs and the first release of a captive-born muskox into the wild herd in 2013.

The Naturalization of the Muskox

These short episodic histories of the muskox in Scandinavia reveal a tension between how we think about animals on the move: as species, versus as individuals. The historical actors as well as modern day scientists primarily talk about the migrant muskoxen at a species level: the calves were moved to start new economic production; all resident muskoxen were targeted as potential transgressors; and the Swedish state and scientists took up the question of whether the muskox was truly a Swedish animal. Human migrations may happen through the choices of individuals but are often categorized by groups or races—news reports cover the migration of North Africans or Roma as if membership in the group erases individuality. Similarly, the muskox exists as a "race," a species which can be legislated and discussed in the abstract. Biologists who created the Red List of threatened and endangered animals in Norway and Sweden have classified the muskox as a foreign resident—it does not belong, and is not worthy of protection. At the same time, the biologists and authorities have not called for eradication of the muskox. The species is tolerable, as long as it does no harm.

In spite of being officially rejected, the muskox as a species has entered Scandinavian culture. As a "race," it has been granted naturalized status within the cultural realm. In the Dovre Mountains region of Norway and the Härjedalen area of Sweden, muskoxen sternly look out from signs, brochures, and posters. Muskoxen overwhelm the visitor to the small but new annex in the Dombås tourist office called the National Park Center. The first thing the visitor sees in the hallway is a muskox skin and that you can touch; special muskox safaris are offered every day by multiple outfitters in town. Likenesses of muskoxen are captured as paperweights, children's toys, and even fire starters. There are very expensive muskox wool knitted

hats and mittens and sweaters for the tourists to buy. As a guide at the Myskoxcentrum stated during a tour of the center, "They are more like a mascot, one can say, or a symbol for Härjedalen."[50] On a cultural level, the tenuous biological viability of the species in Scandinavia continues to prompt concern, as diseases have produced profound population fluctuations including the death of approximately a quarter of the Dovre herd in 2012. Many people identify the muskox as a component of the Scandinavian countryside and are concerned that the species may disappear. Rather than looking only at the muskox's scientific status as a 'non-native,' we must consider its cultural integration.

The views of muskoxen at a species level need to be complemented by thinking on the individual animal level. The muskox migration happened to specific individuals: adult muskox were gunned down and calves forcibly taken from their herds; a lone muskox attacked a human; and a small herd of muskoxen chose to immigrate to Sweden. These were individual life-changing experiences. Some of these movements were chosen by the animals, whereas others were forced upon them, but all of the events happened to specific individual muskoxen. Thinking of the muskoxen as migrants allows us to see when individual animals have been forcibly acted upon by humans wielding power and when individual animals have been able to exercise their own agency.

Examining movements of animals over political borders needs to encompass both species-level history and individual animal histories. What happens to an individual does not necessarily happen to a species as a whole, and vice versa. Although generations of muskoxen have been born and died in Scandinavia over the twentieth century, individuals alive today are migrants caught in limbo, culturally integrated but not officially accepted. Only time will tell if muskoxen are permanent residents of the region, and whether or not the individual immigrants will ever become full citizens of Nordic nature.

9. "Minutes of Proceedings at a Deputation from the Society for the Preservation of the Wild Fauna of the Empire to the Right Hon. The Earl of Elgin, His Majesty's Secretary of State for the Colonies," 23–24.

10. Hornaday, "The Zoological Park of Our Day."

11. P. Chalmers Mitchell, "Zoological Gardens and the Preservation of Fauna," 353–65.

12. Schaller, *The Mountain Gorilla*.

13. Chaillu, *Explorations and Adventures in Equatorial Africa*, 395–99.

14. Osborn, "The Zoological Society's Work for Wildlife."

15. For examples of the killing of adult animals to capture the young, see Hagenbeck, *Beasts and Men*, 57; and Buck and Anthony, *Bring 'Em Back Alive*, 50–60.

16. Velvin, *From Jungle to Zoo*, 88–89.

17. Hanson, *Animal Attractions*, 96–97.

18. Hornaday, "Gorillas, Past and Present"; Velvin, *From Jungle to Zoo*, 91.

19. Hornaday, *Popular Official Guide to the New York Zoological Park*, 65.

20. Hanson, *Animal Attractions*, 44. Also see Nance, *Entertaining Elephants*.

21. Mann, *Wild Animals In and Out of the Zoo*, 21.

22. "The Zoological Park Gets a Gorilla," 1150.

23. Hornaday, "Gorillas, Past and Present," 1181–85.

24. New York Zoological Society, *Sixteenth Annual Report: 1911*, 69; Hornaday, "Gorillas, Past and Present," 1181–85.

25. Hornaday, "Gorillas, Past and Present," 1181–85; New York Zoological Society, *Twentieth Annual Report: 1915*, 67.

26. Hornaday, "Gorillas, Past and Present," 1181–85.

27. Schaller, *The Mountain Gorilla*, 168, 209, 219.

28. "Convention Signed at London, May 19, 1900," *Correspondence Related to the Preservation of Wild Animals in Africa*, 86–91.

29. Buck, quoted in Mann, *Wild Animals In and Out of the Zoo*, 22–23.

30. Carl Akeley, *In Brightest Africa*; Mary L. Jobe Akeley, "Belgian Congo Sanctuaries."

31. Schaller, *The Mountain Gorilla*, 339.

32. Akeley, *In Brightest Africa*, 248; Schaller, *The Mountain Gorilla*, 92–95, 335.

33. William Hornaday to Madison Grant (May 14, 1921) and Henry Osborn to William Hornaday (May 25, 1921), Henry Fairfield Osborn Collection (MSS.0835), Box 51, Folder 9, AMNH.

34. Akeley, *In Brightest Africa*, xii, 248–50.

35. Henry Fairfield Osborn, "Foreword," in Akeley, *In Brightest Africa*, xii.

36. Ibid.; Jones, *In Search of Brightest Africa*, 170–75.

37. "A National Park in the Belgian Congo," 623–24; Akeley, "Belgian Congo Sanctuaries," 289–300.

38. For an example of the optimism for the in-situ approach, see Carey, "Saving the Animal Life of Africa," 73–85.

39. Gregory, "In Quest of Gorillas," 385–95.

40. "Gorillas in West Africa," *The Canberra Times*, March 9, 1928.

41. Osborn, "Conservation of the Gorilla and the Chimpanzee," Notes for *Natural History* (1929?), Henry Fairfield Osborn Collection (MSS.0835), Box 79, Folder 34, AMNH.

42. Minutes, "Report of the First Meeting of the American Committee on International Wild Life Protection," (December 11, 1930), Central Archives, AMNH, 1233.1.

43. Harold Coolidge to William Gregory (February 25, 1931) and George Sherwood to Martin Johnson (April 20, 1931), 1233.1, Central Archives, AMNH. Also see Johnson, *Congorilla*.

44. Animal Acquisition Record, Catalogue number 13,714, RU 386, Box 3, SIA; Stott, Jr., *Exploring with Martin and Osa Johnson*, 49–52; Martin Johnson to George Sherwood (March 7, 1931), 1233, Central Archives, AMNH.

45. Martin Johnson to George Sherwood (March 29, 1931), and George Sherwood to Martin Johnson (April 20, 1931), 1233.1, AMNH; Harold Coolidge to George Sherwood (December 1, 1931), Harold Coolidge to Alexander Wetmore (December 2, 1931), and Harold Coolidge to Alexander Wetmore (December 9, 1931), RU 7006: Wetmore, Alexander, 1886–1978, Box 78, Folder 1, SIA.

46. Harold Coolidge to George Sherwood (December 1, 1931), RU 7006: Wetmore, Alexander, 1886–1978, Box 78, Folder 1, SIA.

47. Johnson, *Congorilla*, 279–80.

48. "Report of the American Committee International Wild Life Protection for the Boone and Crockett Club Meeting, December 19, 1932," RU 7006: Wetmore, Alexander, 1886–1978, Box 79, Folder 3, SIA; Lady Broughton, "A Camera Hunt for the Elusive Gorilla," *New York Times* (November 6, 1932): SM6.

49. Alexander Wetmore to James Chapin, (April 26, 1943), RU 7006: Wetmore, Alexander, 1886–1978, Box 11, Folder 4, SIA.

10. Migrant Muskoxen and the Naturalization of National Identity in Scandanavia

1. Manning, *Migration in World History*.

2. Dingle and Drake, "What Is Migration?" Climate change and the pressure for animals to migrate have of course entered the biological science discussions, but studies are highly quantitative in nature and focus on population shifts and extinctions.

3. For discussions of labels and categories of animal species, I find particularly useful: Smout, "The Alien Species in Twentieth-Century Britain"; and Chew and Hamilton, "The Rise and Fall of Biotic Nativeness."

4. David Turton has argued that the sense of place is a constructed one, so forced migration studies need to account for the shifting meaning of *place* for those who are moved (Turton, "The Meaning of Place in a World of Movement"). I believe that insight applies to animals as well, so we mustn't forget their adaptive capacity when relocated.

5. For general muskox biology and natural history, see Pedersen, *Der Moschusochs*; and Lent, *Muskoxen and Their Hunters*.

6. Nathorst, *Två Somrar i Norra Ishafvet*, 152.

7. For discussion of acclimatization societies in various European contexts, see Weiner, "The Roots of 'Michurinism'"; Dunlap, "Remaking the Land"; Osborne, "Acclimatizing the World"; and Ritvo, "Going Forth and Multiplying."

8. Kolthoff, *Til Spetsbergen*.

9. Ibid., 179. All translations from Norwegian and Swedish texts are my own.

10. Nathorst, *Två Somrar i Norra Ishafvet*, 150–51.

11. "Bröderna Printzsköld gamle förare skildrar dödsfärden till Storlien," *Svenska Dagbladet*, February 18, 1951.

12. Lønø, *Transplantation of the Muskox in Europe and North America*, 6.

13. Schiött ("Musk oxen in captivity") says that Danish expeditions shot all the adult animals, but he thought that Norwegians were capturing calves in nets, instead. But Norwegian reports contradict that claim: they too slaughtered the adults, as reported in *Aftenposten*, "Vil moskusoksen trives på Svalbard?" August 27, 1929, morning edition, 2; and in Hoel, "Moskusoksen: bestand, jakt, fangst, omplanteringsforsøk" (unpublished manuscript, Norsk Polarinstitutt Archive, SM-5138). Anders A. Orvin of the Norwegian Polar Institute estimated in 1947 that three adults had to be killed for each calf captured (Norsk Polarinstitutt—SATØ/S30902/D/Db/L0244, folder 545, Regional State Archives, Tromsø).

14. Alendal, *Overføringer av moskusfe*, 13–16.

15. Lynge, "Moskusoksen i Øst-Grønland."

16. Kolthoff, *Til Spetsbergen*, 178.

17. Hoel, "Moskusokser til Svalbard," 328.

18. Hoel, "Overføring av Moskusokser til Svalbard," 17. Hoel used the Norwegian phrase "slår ihjel" for what was being done to the muskoxen. I have translated this as "slaughter" in the passage, but the literal translation is "strike to death," and when the action is done to a human, it can be translated as "murder."

19. Hoel, "Overføring av Moskusokser til Svalbard," 17.

20. Nicolette, "Moskus på Dovre," *Aftenposten*, October 24, 1932.

21. Anonymous, "Vårt høifjell blir pånyt 'befolket' med moskusdyr," *Aftenposten*, October 10, 1932, evening edition, 1.

22. Anonymous, "Skal moskusdyrene for alvor holde sitt inntog på vårt høifjell?" *Aftenposten*, May 11, 1933, morning edition, 4.

23. Ragnar Solberg, "Møte med moskusokseflokk i Drivdalen," *Aftenposten*, July 13, 1954, morning edition, 2.

24. Anonymous, "Ville fotografere moskusokse, ble tatt på hornene," *Aftenposten*, September 2, 1963, morning edition, 1; Anonymous, "Moskusoksen blitt et problem i Soknedal," *Aftenposten*, September 2, 1963, evening edition, 1.

25. Correspondent, "Moskus i harnisk," *Aftenposten*, September 18, 1963, morning edition, 1.

26. The director of the Norwegian Polar Institute, Tore Gjelsvik, stressed this in his interview in "Moskusoksen blitt et problem i Soknedal," *Aftenposten*, September 2, 1963, evening edition, 1.

27. Correspondent in Trondheim, "Eldre mann ble drept av en moskusokse i Oppdal," *Aftenposten*, July 23, 1964, morning edition, 1.

28. Jon (or John) Angard was an employee of Den Norske Turistforening (DNT) who managed the tourist cabin at Reinheim. It is unclear how he came to have legal responsibility over the herd, but he performed a muskox population survey in 1956 and published the animal's history and current status in Norway in an article for the DNT year book: Angard, "Moskusoksene på Dovrefjell."

29. Telegram to Landbruksdepartementet, August 5, 1964, in folder RA/S-4247/D/ L0095, National Archives, Oslo, Norway. The text of the telegram was also reproduced in newspaper articles.

30. Correspondent in Trondheim, "Stemningen i Åmotdalen er fremdeles amper," *Aftenposten*, August 13, 1964, evening edition, 6.

31. Ibid.

32. The challenges of the "placement" of wild animals in discrete spaces is nicely explored in Bolla and Hovorka, "Placing Wild Animals in Botswana."

33. Correspondent in Trondheim, "Moskusen beskyttet av loven," *Aftenposten*, August 28, 1964, morning edition, 1.

34. As early as 1953, in a letter to the Ministry of Agriculture, the Institute claimed that although it had organized the importation, it was no longer responsible for the animals in the wild (Letter from Norsk Polarinstitutt in folder RA/S-4247/D/ L0095, National Archives, Oslo, Norway). In 1964, the Institute's position was that although it "no longer had anything to do with the muskox herd at Dovre after the importation was completed," it would protest if someone tried "to manage the herd," since the original importation was so costly: Anonymous, "Moskusoksen blitt et problem i Soknedal," *Aftenposten*, September 2, 1963, evening edition, 1.

35. Correspondent in Trondheim, "Moskusen beskyttet av loven," *Aftenposten*, August 28, 1964, morning edition, 1.

36. Correspondent in Trondheim, "Moskusdyr som viser seg i Engan vil bli skutt," *Aftenposten*, September 10, 1964, evening edition, 8.

37. They have become so "naturalized" that when I did field interviews of participants on a muskox safari in 2013, an educated Norwegian woman in her forties did not realize that muskoxen had not been always been present in Norway.

38. Anonymous, "Vilda myskoxar i Härjedalen. Varning: De kan gå till anfall!" *Östersunds-Posten*, September 1, 1971, 1.

39. Björn Berglund, "Hel hjord på väg in i Sverge," *Dagens Nyheter*, September 5, 1971, 1

40. Krystyna Pieniezny, "Myskoxar på svensk mark," *Svenska Dagbladet*, September 8, 1971, 19.

41. Torolf Byfalt, "Världssensation faktum: Myskoxarna i Lofsdalen," *Östersunds-Posten*, October 11, 1971, 1.

42. Anonymous, "Myskoxarna vid sportstuga," *Östersunds-Posten*, September 7, 1971, 1.

43. Anonymous, "Moskusoksene blir i Sverige," *Aftenposten*, January 14, 1972, morning edition, 14.

44. Swedish Post Office, Stamps and Philatelic Service, Mountain World first day issue card, March 27, 1984, author's personal collection.

45. Sveriges Riksdag, Motion 1990/91:Jo759, "Rädda myskoxstammen."

46. Sveriges Riksdag, Betänkande 1990/91:JoU30, "Miljöpolitiken."

47. Sveriges Riksdag, Motion 1999/2000:MJ763, "Myskoxar i Sverige."

48. Gärdenfors, ed., *Rödlistade arter i Sverige 2010—The 2010 Red List of Swedish Species.*

49. Ericson and Ericson, "Myskoxen."

50. Personal interview with author, Tännäs, Sweden, June 20, 2013.

11. Exploring Early Human–Animal Encounters in the Galapagos Islands Using a Historical Zoology Approach

1. The theoretical literature on animal history is large and continually growing, but some of the major works that have influenced this study include Brantz, *Beastly Natures*; Derby, "Bringing the Animals Back In"; Fudge, *Brutal Reasoning*; Few and Tortorici, *Centering Animals*; Malamud, ed., *A Cultural History of Animals in the Modern Age*; Weil, *Thinking Animals.*

2. Whitehead, "Loving, Being, Killing Animals," 339.

3. For example, the science news website *LiveScience* recently described the Galapagos Islands as one of the ten most "pristine" places in the world (Gammon, "The 10 Most Pristine Places on Earth"). For example, panic over the development of tourist infrastructure prompted UNESCO to add the archipelago to its list of Endangered World Heritage Sites in 2007. See "UNESCO Mission Confirms Threat to Galápagos Islands," *UNESCO News*, April 16, 2007, http://whc.unesco.org/en/news/322/, accessed January 20, 2014.

4. See for example, Bassett, *Galapagos at the Crossroads*; D'Orso, *Plundering Paradise*; Grenier, *Conservación Contra Natura*; Idrobo, *Footsteps in Paradise*; Salcedo, *Galápagos.*

5. Hennessy and McLeary, "Nature's Eden?"; James, "Collecting Evolution"; Ospina, *Galápagos, naturaleza y sociedad.*

6. There are some suggestions, which appear especially in Latin American nationalist literature, that the Incas visited the Galapagos, but such arguments are not backed by historical or archaeological evidence.

7. De Berlanga, *A Letter to His Majesty.*

8. William Ambrosia Cowley, "The Voyage of Captain Cowley, Papist."

9. Rogers, *A Cruising Voyage*, entry for September 21, 1709.

10. Grether et al., "The Evolutionary Consequences of Interspecific Aggression."

11. Peiman and Robinson, "Ecology and Evolution of Resource-Related Heterospecific Aggression."

12. Orr, "The Galapagos Sea Lion."

13. We think that the "seales" described by Cowley and Rogers were likely Galapagos Sea Lions (*Zalophus wollebaeki*), based on the size and behavior of the described animals. Galapagos sea lion males can be significantly larger than Galapagos fur seals (*Arctocephalus galapagoensis*). In addition, male Galapagos sea lions patrol their territories in the surf, which means that they could be the animals described by Rogers in his account, "I was on level sand when he came open-mouth'd at me out of the Water."

14. References to "Turtle-Dove" are presumably the Galapagos Dove, which is the only species of dove found commonly on the Galapagos Islands. In addition, Turtle Doves (*Streptopelia turtur*) look similar to the Galapagos Dove.

15. Wafer, *A New Voyage and Description of the Isthmus of America*, 155.

16. "Captain Cowley's Voyage around the GLOBE," in Hacke, *A Collection of Original Voyages*, 9–10.

17. Cooke, *A Voyage to the South Sea and round the World*, entry for May 20–22.

18. See Harris, "Egg-eating by Galapagos Mockingbirds"; and Grant and Grant, "Breeding and Feeding Ecology of the Galápagos Dove."

19. See Silke Berger et al., "Behavioral and Physiological Adjustments to New Predators in an Endemic Island Species"; and Rödl et al., "Tameness and Stress Physiology in a Predator-Naïve Island Species."