

A Research upon Supervision of Bear-Human Issues Using Dog

Shivanand Gotyal¹ Dr. Angur Begum²

¹Research Scholar, CMJ University, Shillong, Meghalaya

²Professor of Zoology, CMJ University, Shillong, Meghalaya Email dr.angur.begum@gmail.com

Abstract – Conflicts between brown bears (*Ursus arctos*) and humans have happened since both species initially possessed habitats simultaneously. In spite of the fact that the way of bear-human conflicts has remained comparative, systems for determining them have enhanced with innovative developments, to the degree that humans and bears now have an improved risk of concurrence. Clash determination strategies utilized within the United States and Russia vary because of the populace status of brown bears in the 2 countries. Different procedures incorporating aversive molding, obstructions, and movement are ordinarily utilized as a part of the United States; bears are evacuated from the populace with the help of Laika dogs in Russia. Consolidating procedures from both countries might essentially enhance methods beforehand utilized uniquely. We talk over management suggestions for adjusting grizzly bear conduct utilizing Laika dogs and extra molding fortification procedures in the United States.

INTRODUCTION

Conflicts between humans and extensive predators have existed throughout the last 4 million years of human presence. Unanticipated proof of these showdowns has been revealed in ancient symbolic representations, petroglyphs, and from the skeletal stays of inherited man. Generally, conflicts were determined by radically diminishing creature populations. Although this may be correct to a degree with present-day populations of vast carnivores, conflicts between humans and a few animal varieties (tigers [*panthera tigris*] in Asia, Asiatic lions [*panthera leo persica*] from Turkey to India, and bears [*ursus thibetanus*—Iran and Pakistan; *U. arctos*—Italy; *U. a. pruinosus*—China; and *U. a. horribilis*—North American lower 48 states]) are to a great extent brought about by immediate effects from misfortune of habitat and removal from human encroachment (U.s. Dep. Entomb. 1990). By and large, expanded contact with humans expedites expanded rate of conflict.

Not until execution of mainland and international laws, regulations, and arrangements in the twentieth century (i.e., Endangered Species Act of 1973 [16 U.s.c. 1531-1544], Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 [16 U.s.c. 1361-1407], Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species [cites], Russian Red Data Book) have numerous wildlife species been saved annihilation by

expanding human technology. Shortly, questionable relationships between expansive predators and humans are moving to conjunction because of expanded seeing by humans of wildlife conduct, state funded instruction, and enhanced conduct adjustment techniques administered at instructing wildlife to maintain a strategic distance from humans (Gillin et al. 1992).

In spite of the fact that the United States of America (U.s.) and Republic of (Russia) are mainlands separated, similitudes exist between their noteworthy associations with expansive predators, particularly with brown bears. To support reasonable populations of brown bears in an environment of expanding human populations and diminishing bear habitat, conservation methods have been intended to safeguard bears and habitat. The reasoning of wiping out an animal varieties for the profit of alternate is no more worthy to people in general or wildlife callings.

We look at over a wide span of time management methods and rationalities of human-brown bear conflicts in the U.s. what's more Russia. Helpful exploration coming about because of this work will at last expedite better comprehension of conduct modification procedures of brown bears in both countries and may furnish extra management devices to districts throughout the planet.

We are appreciative to R. Richardson (U.s. Dep. Agric. For. Serv.) and Dr. C. Servheen (U.s. Fish and Wildl. Serv.) for their deliberations and investment in uniting this undertaking. We additionally stretch out uncommon because of J. Ertel, S. Reagan, and T. Ryder for publication aid and H. McCracken (illustrations) all of Wyoming Game and Fish Department. Subsidizing for the task was given by the Interagency Grizzly Bear Committee and National Fish and Wildlife Foundation.

MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES

To stop decrease of grizzly bears in the U.s., immediate management systems were fused by state and federal orgs under the heading of the Interagency Grizzly Bear Committee. These systems incorporated: reducing all reason for human-affected mortality (hunting, poaching, mishaps), proactively lessening human-grizzly bear conflicts through counteractive action (state funded instruction, food and garbage space regulations, backcountry law requirement watches), migrating or evacuating nuisance bears that were habituated to humans or molded to human foods, and conduct change of adolescent bears or people as they first enter into nuisance circumstances.

In North America, management of nuisance dark bears (*Ursus americanus*) is essential determined through evacuation of the creature, despite the fact that movement and obstacle techniques (e.g., electric fencing) are once in a while utilized. Evacuation of nuisance animals is likewise utilized as a management apparatus with Russian brown bears. Management activities are directed to ensuring people, animals, and agricultural hobbies from bears.

In the Russian Republic, pretty nearly 3,500 licenses are sold to diversion hunters yearly. In any case, the few dozen bears gathered in nuisance circumstances are insignificant contrasted with the harvest from legitimate bear hunting, and evacuation of nuisance bears is not acknowledged a significant impact on the populace.

Hunting issue bears has not been greatly adequate in either nation because of the challenge in verifying which bear is the nuisance. Administrators assume that a few bears are erroneously shot as nuisance animals when they are essentially the first bear experienced. The issue bear might accordingly evade reap and proceed with its nuisance conduct.

Throughout dry season years in the eastern shares of Russia, low precipitation brought about poor rummage generation and expanded bear-human conflicts. The point when these conditions exist, bears in poor physical

condition approach settlements and go after domesticated animals and humans.

Throughout 1962, one of the most exceedingly awful bear food years on record, 767 brown bears were shot in Tuva (south-focal Siberia) and >200 passed on because of barbarianism by different bears. Wildlife authorities evaluated something like 67% of the populace was dispensed with from this district in 1 year (Zyryanov and Smirnov 1992). A comparative circumstance was watched in 1984 in Magadan Oblast (north-eastern Russia) and in different districts of Russia (M.a. Krechmar, Institute of Biology of the North, Magadan, Russia, pers. commun., 1991).

Throughout these calamitous food years, bear conflicts were not effectively illuminated by uprooting nuisance bears because about all bears were included in conflicts. Food accessibility conflicts in Russia were allayed (incompletely) by giving a simulated food supply.

INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVES

The area of the previous Soviet Union, incorporating Russia, has the biggest brown bear populace of any nation worldwide, assessed at 130,000 animals (Servheen 1990). This speaks to >50% of brown bears worldwide. They involve most forested habitats with intermittent observations in remote tundra and steppe locales. Twelve-month reap all around Russia is roughly 10,000 bears and populations are thought to be stable (Servheen 1990).

Instantly, the central technique for overseeing brown bear-human conflicts in Russia is by devastating nuisance bears. Migration is incidentally used to determination human- polar bear (*Ursus maritimus*) conflicts since this species is ensured by Russian (Red Data Book) and international understandings (Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972). Be that as it may, because of challenge in moving polar bears adequately, they are sporadically uprooted from the populace. Human-Asian dark bear (*Ursus thibetanus*) conflicts are moderately uncommon. In the event that conflicts occur, hunting grants are issued by the Russian Game Department to uproot nuisance animals.

From the early 1800s to the turn of the century, grizzly (brown) bear populations diminished in a great part of the United States south of Canada because of the infringement of western pilgrims. Human-bear experiences, incorporating domesticated animals plunder control, security of human life, habitat deterioration, business trapping, and game hunting were answerable for the greater part of the decay (Stebler 1972, Martinka 1976, Brown 1985). The grizzly populace in the lower 48 states

as evaluated between 50,000 and 100,000 between 1880 and the turn of the century. By 1975, <1,000 grizzlies were assessed to possess <2% of their previous range.

Prior to 1975, grizzly bears that caused problems in the U.S. were killed by hunting, trapping, and poisoning. However, when populations dropped to alarmingly low levels and grizzly bears were subsequently protected as a threatened species under the 1973 Endangered Species Act, alternative management methods were needed to reestablish viable populations.

BEHAVIOR MODIFICATION

Conduct change of research center animals has been fruitful (Pavlov 1927, Karpicke et al. 1978, Rescorla 1988). These routines have been adjusted for utilization on free-extending wildlife in an endeavor to address conflicts between humans and wildlife utilizing behavioral molding (Gillin et al. 1992). Lately, conduct change research on bears in the U.S. incorporated the utilization of taste revulsions (Hastings and Gilbert 1981, Hunt 1984), sound-related molding (Woolridge and Belton 1980, Greene 1982), airborne splash repellents that disturb mucous films (Miller 1980, Hunt 1984, Rogers 1984), electric fencing (Dacy 1939, Robinson 1961, Wynnnyk and Gunson 1977), and aversive molding utilizing non-deadly shots (Clarkson 1989, Dalle-Molle and Van Horn 1989, Shideler and Hetchel 1991, Gillin et al. 1992). These studies had blended comes about yet all showed some level of triumph if negative fortification was connected as often as possible and when the culpable creature was occupied with nuisance conduct. The most astounding victory in altering bear conduct happened when the negative fortification was connected when the nuisance creature was occupied with the beginning clash incident and was not extremely habituated or molded to human foods (Gillin et al. 1992). Different elements, for example, creature condition, impacted prosperity of molding experiments.

BROWN BEARS AND LAIKA DOGS

In Russia, Laika dogs are currently trained to locate, deter, and protect humans from brown bears. The dogs were developed in Russia and used historically to drive off large predators from human habitations. More recently the dogs have also been used for hunting many types of game animals, including brown bears. Laikas are from a variety of dogs known as Spitz; similar to the Siberian husky, they appear slimmer (25-31 kg), taller (50-60 cm), and are not as deep through the chest. The coat is generally brown or gray with white markings on the head, throat, chest, and feet. Fur is moderate-length, dense, and straight. The ears are erect and short and the tail is upturned and curved.

Laikas are known for great courage, aggressiveness, and obedience to their master. The dogs are quite intelligent and respond to commands given by the handler during hunting or field trial situations. During confrontations with bears, the dogs bite the bear from behind and avoid front claw strikes and bites. Russian bear hunters generally prefer several well-trained dogs to an armed companion hunter. In the U.S., various hound breeds are used for locating black bears for harvest. However, U.S. dogs are generally not trained to respond to commands by the dog handler while trailing a bear (J. Ertel, Wyoming Game and Fish Dep., Lander, pers. commun., 1991).

Individual brown bears react differently toward attacking dogs. These reactions include escape behavior or defensively attacking the dogs depending on circumstances of the contact. The reaction of bears to dogs is often similar to the bears reaction to humans. If a bear is not afraid of humans, it may not be fearful of dogs.

In confrontations with dogs, bears will generally escape to cover. However, experienced dogs are wary of following bears into dense cover where they cannot effectively and safely attack and where they lose their advantage of maneuverability.

Not all Laika dogs are suited for deterring nuisance bears. As with any working or sporting dog breed, individual Laikas possess different behavioral and personality traits. Some Laikas may fear bears or be indifferent or aggressive toward them. Less aggressive dogs will bark at a bear 25-30 meters away. Results of Laika dog trials held by the Russian Game Society with captured bears showed 15-20% of the dogs to be relatively aggressive. The dogs harassed the bear by barking from short distances of 2-3 meters and were considered useful for hunting and locating bear dens. A small percentage of the dogs (2-3%) were more aggressive and bit the bear while attacking. These were considered effective in all situations, including providing safety to humans (B.R. Zavatzkiy, Sayano-Shushenskiy State Nature Reserve, Krasnoyarsk region, Russia, pers. commun., 1991). The use of >1 dog provided the strongest negative stimulus to a bear. In actual conflicts, the use of several dogs had higher success at deterring a bear permanently from a conflict site than use of a single dog.

CONFLICT SITUATIONS

Throughout 1992, 24 conflicts including humans and grizzly bears happened in the Yellowstone biological system. These circumstances could have been adequate tests of Laika dogs in dissuading bears. Dogs may have been convenient in stopping or anticipating sheep and cows plunder, roadside bears, property harm, and bear

visits to backcountry camps, roadside camps, and trail heads. The accompanying circumstances are numerous cases where Laikas could be utilized within management of human-bear conflicts.

Yellowstone National Park has repeating issues with bears entering and at times getting food remunerates in campgrounds and improved areas (K. Gunther, Yellowstone Natl. Park Bear Manage. Off., Mammoth, pers. commun., 1991). Human-habituated roadside bears, encouraging on characteristic rummage, have additionally made issues with travelers and picture takers approaching dangerously close to bears. Aversive molding methods utilizing Bear Deterrent Cartridge elastic shots (AAI Corporation, Hunt Valley, MD 21030) has had little impact, and a number of the bears kept sustaining in the wake of being hit with the shot. A few of the bears that finished not react to elastic slug aversive molding had been habituated to humans for a great portion of their grown-up lives (Gillin et al. 1992). Provocation of these bears by Laikas could show the bears to rummage further from locales utilized by or noticeable to humans or the bears may scrounge during the evening when humans are not introduce.

A dairy cattle farm in the southern allotment of the ecosystem had grizzly bears entering building and corral areas throughout spring calving periods to feast upon fetal membrane in 1992. The bears were seen every day by farm staff throughout foreseeable times. Throughout the mid year months, the issue advanced to cows ravaging on open and private property. It was obscure if the same bears were included in the conflicts throughout the spring.

Along the southwestern and northeastern parts of the Yellowstone environment, sheep brushing practices tricked grizzly and dark bears into conflicts throughout 1991 and 1992. The point when dark or grizzly bears spotted a provincial sheep group, they regularly accompanied the crowd and executed and bolstered on sheep until the bears were migrated or the group left the reach of the bear (Wyoming Game and Fish Dep. Clash Resolution records 1991, 1992, Lander, unpubl. information).

Throughout August 1992, a grizzly bear entered an unoccupied U.S. Woods Service lodge where the bear rummaged on accessible food. After the occurrence, the lodge was cleaned of all food and secured with bolted entryways and substantial wooden window screens. Be that as it may, the bear returned, crushed the shades, and entered through the window. Throughout this second visit by the bear, Laika dogs may have been utilized to condition the bear to escape backcountry lodges through cooperation of the lodges with the dogs.

A significant part of the Yellowstone biological system is roadless wilderness with backcountry trekking, outdoors, and hunting increases every twelve-months. Expanded human utilization of these areas gives expanded chance for bears to clash with humans through dishonorably saved food and gathered diversion. These sorts of conflicts are accounted for 1-2 times consistently. The quick clash is frequently determined by securing food and diversion bodies from grizzly bears. Nonetheless, bears that have been remunerated by food in back nation camps will frequently visit different camps and may be compensated once more.

MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS IN THE UNITED STATES

Throughout most experiences in the U.S., bears escape human contact (Herrero 1985). This is likewise accurate in Russia. Other human meeting behaviors showed by bears could be non-combative interest and protective aggression (Herrero 1985). Zavatzkiy (1986) assessed numerous hundred experiences in Russia and indicated that aggressive bears spoke to 1.6% of populace. Conflicts usually emerged when a bear was amazed by humans. Throughout such an experience, a bear may see the human as a danger, and ambush protectively (Herrero 1985). In both countries, the most common reason for attacks incorporate sudden encounters, food guarding, insurance of whelps by females, and incitement from badgering and close experiences by humans (e.g., photographic artists, vacationers, and so on.). Numerous bear-human conflicts include bears that have accepted human foods or are habituated to humans along roadsides and in improvements (Gillin et al. 1992). Reactions of bears fluctuate relying upon the circumstances and the bear's habituation to humans (Dalle-Molle and Van Horn 1989, Gillin et al. 1992).

COMBINING NEGATIVE REINFORCEMENT TECHNIQUES

During the symposium on "Human-Large Predators: strategy of relations" held in Moscow in 1985, bear specialists stressed that it is critical to encourage acceptable behavior in large predators to avoid elimination of predator populations. However, the use of Laika dogs as a technique cannot be considered a panacea for all bear-human conflicts. Human behavior must also be controlled by avoiding development in bear habitat and eliminating all sources of human food to bears. This would also be true if the Laika dogs were used in the U.S.

During some encounters in Russia and the U.S., other breeds of dogs have been known to provoke bears to attack people. In these situations, a bear defending itself

from a dog may turn on a human as the dog seeks protection near its master. To avoid injury to humans, Laikas will need to be trained to stop a bear under any situation from attacking the human dog handler or bystanders.

Combining additional negative reinforcement techniques with the use of dogs may be more effective in modifying behavior for nuisance bear situations. A hypothetical situation may include a bear that entered a campground and during its initial contact with humans was rewarded by food. The next time the bear returned to the conflict site, Laika dogs could be released by the handler on the bear while it is near the campground, provided the site was cleared of campers and other humans. As the dogs harassed the bear, additional audible, visual, or physical negative reinforcement techniques could be applied.

The additional negative reinforcement or deterrent measure will require that it be specific to the bear and not affect the dogs. This limits the use of airborne spray irritants. An audible frequency that acts as an unconditioned stimulus may prove useful, but barking dogs will also serve in this capacity.

Firing projectiles at the bear might also be considered. This could be accomplished using a Thumper Gun system (a Model 267 Smith and Wesson gas and flare gun converted to a 32 mm bore) (Gillin et al. 1992), 12-gauge shotgun Bear Deterrent Cartridges, or a crossbow deterrent round. Other methods that may succeed are electric shock, fencing, or the use of a loud and intimidating visual display (e.g., high pressure CO₂ canister used in fire extinguisher).

In Russia and the U.S., research efforts designed to develop effective behavior modification techniques for brown bears using Laikas may prove to be a useful management tool. These techniques should cause bears to avoid humans and not injure the bears.

REFERENCES

- DACY, G.H. 1939. Electrified fence, it control honey-stealing bears. *Gleanings in Bee Culture* 67:619-621.
- ROBINSON, F.A. 1961. Bees, bears, and electric fences. *Gleanings in Bee Culture* 89(3):137-141.
- BROWN, D.E. 1985. *The Grizzly in the Southwest*. Univ. of Oklahoma Press, Norman. 274pp.
- HERRERO, S. 1985. *Bear Attacks: Their Causes and Avoidance*. Lyons and Buford Publ., New York, N.Y. 287pp.
- GREENE, R.J. 1982. An application of behavioral technology to the problem of nuisance bears. *The Psychol. Rec.* 32:501- 511.
- MILLER, G.D. 1980. Behavioral and physiological characteristics of grizzly and polar bears, and their relation to bear repellents. M.S.T thesis, Univ. of Montana, Missoula. 106pp.
- KARPICKE, J.G. CHRISTOPH, G. PETERSON, AND E. HEARST. 1978. Signal location and positive versus negative conditioned suppression in the rat. *J. Exp. Psychol. Anim. Behav. Process* 3:105-118.
- WOOLRIDGE, D.R. AND P. BELTON. 1980. Natural and synthesized aggressive sounds as polar bear repellents. *Int. Conf. Bear Res. and Manage.* 4:85-91.
- ROGERS, L.L. 1984. Reactions of free-ranging black bears to capsaicin spray repellent. *Wildl. Soc. Bull.* 12:56-61.
- SERVHEEN, C. 1990. The status and conservation of the bears of the world. *Int. Conf. Bear Res. and Manage. Monogr. Series No. 2*. 32pp.
- ZAVATZKIY, B. 1986. *Okhotai okhotnichykh hozyaystvo*. 4:15-16. (In Russian) (250 encounters with brown bears).
- PAVLOV, I.P. 1927. *Conditioning reflexes*. Oxford Univ. Press, New York, N.Y. 430pp.