

Berlin Rewilding Konferenz

Coexistence, Rewilding and the Wolf in the EU

Thanks to everyone who joined us on **23 February 2026** for this special German-language session on wolf coexistence, rewilding and EU wolf protection, and particular thanks to our speaker, [Dr Thorsten Gieser](#), and to our moderator, [Annemarie Botzki](#). Below is a detailed recap of the discussion with useful links and follow-up resources. Dr Gieser's presentation slides are available [here](#) and the video recording is available [here](#).

Background and Context

Setting the scene

This session was organised and moderated by [Annemarie Botzki](#) of the [Berlin Rewilding Konferenz](#), and hosted by [Edwina Dunn](#) and [Johanna Gluhak](#) of the [Lifescape Project](#), as a German-language event in response to the downlisting of wolves as a strictly protected species and Germany's decision to include the wolf in the Federal Hunting Act ("*Bundesjagdgesetz*").

It followed two previous [Rewilding Law Group](#) calls on wolf protection held in October 2025 ([Part I, with Prof Arie Trouwborst on the EU legal framework](#)) and December 2025 ([Part II, with Gaia Angelini on the CJEU cases challenging the downlisting](#)).

The call took place on the same day as the German Bundestag [committee hearing](#) on whether to include the wolf in the Federal Hunting Act, shortly after a [demonstration](#) in front of the Bundestag in Berlin.

Annemarie Botzki is a climate campaigner, strategist and writer based in Germany. Annemarie works on shifting narratives and building campaigns around fossil fuel exit and food system transformation. She was co-organiser of the 2024 Berlin Rewilding Conference (together with [Simone Böcker](#)) and co-editor of [Wann wenn nicht wir](#), the German Extinction Rebellion book.

The topic for the evening was: following the downgrading of the wolf's protection status at EU level, and amid growing calls for wolf hunting in Germany, what does this mean for rewilding, biodiversity, and the possibility of coexistence between humans, livestock and predators?

Speaker – Dr Thorsten Gieser

About Dr Thorsten Gieser

[Dr Thorsten Gieser](#) is a cultural anthropologist and Academic Staff Member at the Institute for Cultural Studies (Seminar Ethnologie), [University of Koblenz](#). His research focuses on human-nature and human-animal relationships, including extensive fieldwork on wolf coexistence in Germany and internationally (including Mongolia).

He is a Research Associate at the Czech Academy of Sciences (ERC Project [BOAR: Hunting for Wild Boar Futures in the Times of African Swine Fever](#)) and Visiting Associate Professor at the Graduate School of Education, Tohoku University, Japan. He also participates in the SSHRC-funded project [SACTS "Sensory Acts:](#)

	<p>More than human Communication in the Circumpolar North” at the University of Regina, Canada.</p> <p>Dr Gieser is the author of Leben mit Wölfen: Affekte, Gefühle und Stimmungen in Mensch-Wolf-Beziehungen (transcript Verlag, Human-Animal Studies series), a study of affects, emotions and moods in human-wolf relationships drawing on his field research.</p>
<p><i>Coexistence as a test of our relationship with nature</i></p>	<p>Dr Gieser opened by framing the wolf question as a litmus test for our relationship with the natural world. The return of wolves to Germany after an absence of roughly 100–200 years (longer in some regions) was never inevitable – it was the product of what he called a ‘cultural revolution’: the emergence, across the 20th century, of a positive conception of wilderness, species protection and biodiversity as values in their own right.</p> <p>This shift was expressed in a cascade of legal instruments: the Washington Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES, 1973), the Bern Convention (1979), the EU Habitats Directive (1992), and Germany’s Federal and State Nature Conservation Acts (Bundesnaturschutzgesetz / Landesnaturschutzgesetze). These create a graduated protection regime: strictly protected – protected – not protected.</p> <p>What was historically unprecedented in parts of Europe over the past 25 years, Thorsten argued, was not just the legal protection, but the guiding principle of coexistence: rather than regulating wolves through hunting, the return of wolves was conceived as a form of <i>Zusammenleben</i> – living together – with livestock farming continuing alongside wolf populations. This remains a work in progress and a genuine experiment, but it is one in which Germany, in particular, had invested significantly.</p>
<p><i>The coexistence model is now under threat</i></p>	<p>This model is now under serious threat. Dr Gieser outlined a decade-long, coordinated lobbying effort by conservative parties, farmers’ associations, hunting associations and equestrian organisations to reduce or eliminate the wolf’s protected status. He noted the existence of strategic papers going back approximately ten years setting out how to achieve the removal of protection across the EU.</p> <p>The recent political process unfolded rapidly: in 2023, EU Commission President von der Leyen and the European People’s Party (EPP) initiated the process to downgrade the wolf’s status from ‘strictly protected’ to ‘protected’; in 2025 the Bern Convention followed suit (Appendix II → III); and the EU Habitats Directive was amended accordingly (Annex IV → V). EU Member States can now adapt their national legislation. (For the legal background to these changes, see the recaps of Part I and Part II of the Rewilding Law Group wolf series.)</p> <p>In Germany, the government initiated legislative proceedings in Autumn 2025 to amend the nature conservation framework and incorporate the wolf into the Federal Hunting Act (Bundesjagdgesetz). On the day of this webinar (23 February 2026), a Bundestag committee hearing on that proposal was taking place. The key expert statements (from Prof. Dr Hans-Dieter</p>

Pfannenstiel, Felix Körner, Frank Hahnel, Ilka Reinhardt and others) and the recording of those proceedings are available [here](#).

Dr Gieser identified three possible scenarios emerging from the German debate:

- a) **No coexistence (the Norway model):** wolf-free zones in which wolves can be shot as soon as they leave a designated zone, as currently applies in Norway.
- b) **Minimal coexistence (the Sweden model):** a low numerical ceiling on wolf numbers with rigorous hunting beyond that threshold. Sweden has progressively lowered its minimum population target.
- c) **Coexistence with regulated hunting:** continuation of coexistence alongside limited culling, focused primarily on wolves that overcome livestock protection measures or are habituated to humans.

Germany's current legislative proposals appear to leave the door open to all three, with key questions – including whether wolf-free grazing zones will be established, the scope of off-take, and how 'favourable conservation status' (*günstiger Erhaltungszustand*) will be defined – to be resolved in state-level legislation and regulation in the coming years. One of the most concerning developments, Thorsten noted, is that the [Federal Environment Ministry \(deliberately?\) redefined the reference ranges](#) used to declare a 'favourable conservation status', a move that appears to have been driven by political rather than scientific considerations. Whether the [EU's](#) scientific advisers will accept this redefinition remains to be seen.

Why protection still matters: 4 reasons

Against the argument that 'the wolf has recovered and should now be managed like any other species', Dr Gieser offered four reasons why a generous interpretation of the wolf's protection status remains important:

1. **Small and isolated subpopulations.** Populations remain fragmented across Europe, and the genetic connectivity between them is worsening year by year due to the proliferation of fencing in Central and Eastern Europe – driven by concerns about migration movements, African Swine Fever, and border security. This makes it harder for wolves to recolonise and maintain viable populations.
2. **Illegal killing.** Poaching remains a significant threat across Europe – and the direction of travel on legal hunting (in France, parts of Scandinavia, Switzerland) is consistently toward more killing, not less. Sweden was recently reprimanded by the courts for its hunting levels.
3. **Radical opposition.** Unlike almost any other species, the wolf faces organised, radically hostile stakeholder groups for whom the extermination rationale of past centuries has never been superseded by a 'cultural revolution'. Reducing the protection status while such groups exist – particularly if hunting is placed in the hands of those with the most negative attitudes toward wolves – carries obvious risks.

Why hunting is not the answer: 4 bad arguments

4. **The wolf's history of extermination.** The wolf is not an ordinary wildlife species in European cultural memory. The unique history of persecution means that a reduced protection framework cannot be treated in the same way as the management of other recovered species.

Dr Gieser then examined the four main official justifications offered for wolf hunting and found each to be scientifically weak:

1. **Population control:** In Germany, population growth has already slowed markedly in recent years. The German Documentation and Information Centre on Wolves ([DBBW](#)) data shows that population dynamics are self-regulating to a considerable extent. The argument that hunting is needed for population control does not hold.
2. **Livestock protection:** General hunting of wolves has not been scientifically shown to reduce livestock losses; only highly targeted removal of specific individuals responsible for repeated attacks may have some effect. General culling does not substitute for effective herd protection.
3. **Maintaining wariness of humans:** The argument that hunting maintains or restores wolves' fear of humans is scientifically unsubstantiated. As Thorsten observed: if this were true, Germany would not have wild boar in its cities – a species subject to intense hunting pressure that continues to live in close proximity to people.
4. **Pacifying the conflict:** The idea that giving hunters and farmers a limited harvest will buy acceptance is ethically questionable (should animals be killed to satisfy political preferences?) and empirically unsupported. There is no good evidence that token hunting seasons reduce opposition; the evidence from Scandinavia suggests the opposite – each reduction in the minimum target is followed by pressure for further reductions.

The DBBW data for 1991–2026 shows 1,374 recorded wolf mortalities in Germany; of these, the largest category (1026) is from road accidents, 127 illegal killings, 110 natural causes, 73 unclear, 20 from management actions, 15 still to be determined and 3 other causes (e.g. injury / hanging in fence).

Predator ecology and why it is absent from the debate

One of the most striking observations in Dr Gieser's presentation was that despite the wolf's supposed ecological significance being a central argument for protection, predator ecology is almost entirely absent from the current political debate. He explored why.

Research by [Kuijper et al. \(2024\)](#) examines what happens when wolves recolonise heavily human-modified European landscapes — the dominant landscape type across most of Central Europe. The paper identifies multiple ways in which human pressures (hunting, agriculture, landscape fragmentation, managed ungulate populations, impoverished carnivore communities) constrain the wolf's traditional ecological impacts. Several recent European studies have found limited or no support for the trophic cascade

	<p>effects and ungulate behavioural responses documented in less disturbed systems such as Yellowstone National Park in the US.</p> <p>Dr Gieser drew on this research to argue that in heavily human-modified European landscapes, wolves face real constraints on fulfilling the ecological roles documented in less disturbed systems, and that advocates should be cautious about over-relying on simplified "Yellowstone effect" narratives that may not hold up to scrutiny in the European context. Rather than weakening the ecological case for wolves, he suggested this calls for a more honest and nuanced framing of it. He also argued that a more durable and philosophically grounded case for coexistence should extend beyond ecological utility to embrace the intrinsic value of wolves and a relational understanding of how humans and wolves can share landscapes (see below).</p> <p><i>Author's note: One dimension of wolf ecology that is largely absent from both the current political debate and from Kuijper et al.'s analysis is the significant ecosystem contribution wolves make through carrion. Wolf kills provide a critical food source for a remarkably wide range of species — camera-trap monitoring in the Netherlands recorded > 95 bird and mammal species benefiting from carcasses, including indirect beneficiaries such as little owls feeding on maggots and squirrels collecting fur for nesting material and >1000 species of invertebrates benefitting (Beekers, 2017). For more on this, see the Rewilding Europe webinar on restoring food chains featuring Bart Beekers of ARK Nature.</i></p>
<p><i>A new anti-wolf ecological narrative</i></p>	<p>Dr Gieser drew attention to a new and increasingly prominent ecological argument being deployed against the wolf (and against rewilding more broadly). The argument runs as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Wolves cannot fulfil their ecological role due to human overactivity and dysfunctional ecosystems. 2. Therefore wolves have no ecological utility. 3. Livestock farming, by contrast, is essential for the ecosystems of cultural landscapes and their biodiversity. 4. Wolves are therefore a problem for ecosystems and for other protected species. <p>This narrative – positioning the wolf as an ecological threat rather than an ecological asset – is gaining scientific support from some quarters, including from prominent wildlife biologists such as Klaus Hackländer (Professor of Wildlife Biology and Game Management; Chair of the Deutsche Wildtier Stiftung) as well as Marcel Züger and Marie Hoffmann. It is also being used to argue for wolf-free grazing zones, and to pit rewilding (conceived as self-regulating wilderness) against managed cultural landscapes and their associated biodiversity.</p>
<p><i>Drivers of conflict</i></p>	<p>Dr Gieser distinguished carefully between the real conflict (between wolves and livestock farmers, which is genuine but manageable) and the politically amplified broader social conflict (presented as a conflict between 'rural communities' or 'society' and wolves). The latter is largely a political construction. Small farmers' associations, once relatively marginal on the wolf issue, became</p>

significantly more effective once the main agricultural lobby organisations engaged – and built coalitions with local government, regional political parties, hunting and equestrian organisations.

Dr Gieser drew attention to a significant and underappreciated power imbalance in the wolf debate. Those lobbying for hunting and reduced protection are embedded in dense networks of local and regional organisations: farmers' associations at every administrative level, hunting associations, equestrian organisations, local councils and conservative parties from municipal level to the Bundestag. These networks have deep roots in rural communities and direct lines to elected representatives.

Wolf conservation organisations, by contrast, are mostly small, volunteer-led and poorly resourced. The large established environmental organisations (NABU, WWF, BUND) have – in Dr Gieser's view – been increasingly quiet on the wolf issue in recent years, which he suggested is one reason Germany now finds itself in its current legislative position. Well-resourced and legally active NGOs have a role to play, particularly on the legal challenges now before the CJEU (Cases [T-634/24](#) and [T-563/25](#)), but on-the-ground advocacy remains heavily dependent on smaller organisations.

Two main drivers of this conflict beyond the livestock issue itself were identified: (1) **media and social media**, characterised by an 'affective barrage' (*affektives Dauerfeuer*) of one-sided reporting, sensationalism and misinformation; and (2) **politics**, involving politicians, parties, stakeholders and self-styled 'wolf experts' who circulate disinformation in rural areas and often serve as the sole source of information for many local residents.

How coexistence can succeed

Against these pressures, Dr Gieser outlined two main positive contributions to coexistence:

1. **Improving livestock protection (Herdenschutz).** This remains the core of the real conflict. The many organisations working on wolf coexistence in Germany – such as the Gesellschaft zum Schutz der Wölfe and others – already dedicate the majority of their effort to supporting livestock farmers rather than monitoring wolves. State competence centres have made progress on technical solutions and compensation schemes, though progress has been slower than needed.
2. **Building a relationship with wolves.** From fieldwork in Germany and Mongolia, Thorsten observed that in cultures where wolves have always been present alongside livestock, people develop a relationship with wolves – knowledge of individuals, habits, territories – and it is this relational foundation that makes coexistence possible. In Germany, by contrast, wolves are managed as a population or flagged as 'problem individuals' but are not known as animals. A deeper problem here is that both official wolf management and many scientists tell us that we can live with wolves but should ignore them – keeping our distance, not engaging. Thorsten challenged this directly: how do you

	<p>live with someone you are supposed to ignore? He drew an analogy with migrants in a city: you do not achieve a functioning shared community by pretending others are not there; you have to build some form of relationship. The same applies to wolves. Ignoring wolves does not make the problems go away – it removes the foundation on which coexistence depends. This does not mean seeking proximity to wolves (the standard guidance to avoid attracting wolves and to keep a respectful distance remains sound), but it does mean taking wolves seriously as individual living beings rather than as an abstract population to be managed or feared. Thorsten grounded this approach in the philosopher Jens Soentgen's concept of an 'ecology of subjects' (<i>Ökologie der Subjekte</i>), which proposes that ecology should attend to animals as experiencing subjects rather than merely as objects of study – a shift in perspective that also opens the door to a different kind of human relationship with wildlife. Wolf tracking, wildlife tourism and nature awareness initiatives that help people encounter and learn to read wolf presence in the landscape can begin to build this foundation.</p>
<p><i>The deeper question: why do we want coexistence?</i></p>	<p>Perhaps the most philosophically substantial part of Dr Gieser's presentation was his challenge to both sides of the debate to address a question that is rarely asked: <i>why do we want coexistence?</i> – rather than the more common, utilitarian question of <i>what use are wolves to us?</i></p> <p>He argued that accepting the utility framing is itself a concession: if a living being must prove its usefulness to justify its existence, we have already adopted the worldview of those who would destroy it. The ecological arguments for the wolf (trophic cascades, biodiversity benefits) are important but vulnerable to counter-arguments and do not provide a stable foundation for protection. A more durable case for coexistence would rest on the intrinsic value of other living beings and on what it means for humans to share the world with other species – questions that touch on ethics, culture and what kind of nature-relationship we want to cultivate.</p> <p>Thorsten observed that after nearly seven years of field research on this topic in Germany, he rarely hears these deeper questions being asked, even by wolf conservation organisations. The Gesellschaft zum Schutz der Wölfe published a useful report <i>Der Wolf – Kostenfaktor oder nützlicher Rückkehrer?</i> (The Wolf – Cost Factor or Useful Returnee?), to which Thorsten contributed. However, he noted that even engaging with this framing risks accepting the premise that an animal's existence requires instrumental justification.</p>

Discussion

<p><i>Biodiversity of grazed land – challenging the narrative</i></p>	<p>Comment: A participant with a veterinary background challenged the claim, prominent in anti-wolf discourse, that grazed land has the highest biodiversity value. This is a sweeping generalisation that</p>
---	---

<p><i>Agricultural subsidies as an incentive for coexistence</i></p>	<p>does not hold in practice: many intensively grazed Alpine pastures have poor biodiversity, grazed land is often fertilised by animal excrement, and historical stocking rights (Weideservitute) have not been updated despite livestock animals growing significantly heavier over recent decades. The claim needs to be robustly countered with reference to the scientific literature, as it is being used to argue that wolf presence undermines high-value cultural landscapes.</p> <p>Suggestion: A participant proposed that EU Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) direct payments could be restructured to incentivise coexistence with large carnivores. If livestock farmers received enhanced payments in areas where wolves, bears or lynx are present, this might shift the economic calculus significantly – turning the presence of predators from a cost into a benefit. Participants were encouraged to explore relevant networks and share links on this topic.</p>
<p><i>Who speaks for the wolf in expert hearings?</i></p>	<p>Comment: A participant noted the problem of who gets invited as ‘wolf experts’ to parliamentary and regional hearings. Figures who are prominent wolf critics and well known in agricultural and hunting networks are regularly called as expert witnesses, while field researchers with direct experience of wolf ecology and behaviour are not. The suggestion was that conservation organisations and networks should build and maintain lists of credible scientific experts available to be nominated for parliamentary and committee hearings at both federal and state level.</p>
<p><i>Urban populations and untapped potential</i></p>	<p>Question: How engaged is the urban population in Germany with wolf issues, and is there potential to mobilise urban public opinion in support of wolf protection?</p> <p>Response: Thorsten acknowledged that systematic research on urban wolf attitudes is lacking. General public attitude surveys suggest wolf support in the population as a whole, but this rarely translates into active engagement. The urban majority simply does not think about the issue. However, this indifference also means there is significant potential for outreach and public education – the challenge is that pro-wolf public events in rural areas have become increasingly difficult to hold safely due to intimidation, and the digital space is dominated by well-organised anti-wolf groups. Urban outreach campaigns, creative events and education initiatives that reach people who are not already engaged are therefore particularly valuable.</p>
<p><i>The intrinsic value of wolves and a shift in narrative</i></p>	<p>Question: Could a shift toward emphasising the intrinsic value of wolves – away from utilitarian ecological arguments – offer a more durable basis for protection? Are there signs of such a shift, and what might encourage it?</p> <p>Response: This question resonated strongly with Thorsten. He suggested that the utilitarian framing has always been a trap: as soon as wolves’ ecological utility is contested (as it now is, in degraded landscapes), the argument for protection is weakened. A</p>

	<p>deeper argument based on the intrinsic value of wolves as living beings, and on what humans lose when they cannot share the land with apex predators, is more philosophically stable – but requires a cultural and ethical conversation that is not currently happening at scale. Wolf tracking, wildlife observation and similar experiential encounters can contribute to this shift by creating a direct relationship with wolves as individuals rather than abstractions.</p>
<p><i>Social media, disinformation and the limits of fact-checking</i></p>	<p>Comment/Experience shared: A participant with experience leading a transnational livestock protection project shared detailed findings about the online anti-wolf ecosystem. Analysis of the Facebook groups most active in anti-wolf campaigning (including ‘Safety Alps’, ‘Weidezone Deutschland’, ‘Weidezone Tirol’) revealed that their most active members were not primarily livestock farmers but included many individuals with no connection to farming – and that the same networks had previously organised around COVID vaccine refusal and other conspiracy content. Real farmers with genuine herd protection needs were largely absent from these public-facing groups; when the project switched to anonymous webinars (farmer-to-farmer format), participation leapt from 5 to 500, with 90% identifying as farmers. The lesson drawn was that engaging with or trying to rebut the most extreme anti-wolf online content is counterproductive – these groups thrive on conflict and use scientific arguments as material for further disinformation. The more effective strategy was to move to quiet, trusted, peer-to-peer channels.</p> <p>See the LIFEstockProtect project.</p>
<p><i>The violence of language: ‘problem wolf’, ‘risk wolf’</i></p>	<p>Comment: A participant pointed out that the very terminology used to discuss wolves – ‘Problemwolf’ (problem wolf), ‘Risikowolf’ (risk wolf) – frames the animal not as an ordinary wild animal but as something requiring human management, and thereby creates the political and legal space for killing. Language and framing matter enormously in this debate. The wolf is not a problem; it is made into one by human choices.</p>
<p><i>The word ‘coexistence’ as a liability</i></p>	<p>Observation: A participant with experience in transboundary carnivore projects made the counterintuitive suggestion that the word ‘coexistence’ (Koexistenz) may itself be damaging in conversations with livestock farmers. A predator will always take livestock: that is its nature. Asking farmers to ‘coexist’ with something that will kill their animals implies an impossible expectation and immediately antagonises them. A more productive framing may be: ‘You do what you need to do; we’ll do what we need to do. Let’s exchange information.’ – acknowledging the conflict without demanding that farmers accept it. Thorsten noted this as a valuable practical insight from the field.</p>
<p><i>Intimidation and the closing of discourse space</i></p>	<p>Comment: Dr Gieser added – from his own research experience in Germany – that a growing but largely invisible problem is the intimidation of those who organise or attend pro-coexistence events. Organisers report being threatened, verbally and physically; venues withdraw their facilities for wolf-related events; individuals</p>

reduce their public activism. This quiet chilling effect on civil society engagement with the wolf issue is rarely discussed but is having a real impact on the space available for public debate.

Resources and Follow-up

Dr Gieser's book

Leben mit Wölfen: Affekte, Gefühle und Stimmungen in Mensch-Wolf-Beziehungen, Thorsten Gieser (transcript Verlag, Human-Animal Studies). A cultural-anthropological study of affects, emotions and moods in human-wolf relationships. Available [here](#).

All About Wolves

[Der Wolfspodcast](#) with Sabine Sebald features a wealth of scientific facts, fascinating information about the lives of wild wolves, as well as political and legal background information and news updates. Conversations with experts (including Thorsten) offer diverse perspectives on the topic of wolves.

Wolf ecology and attitudes to Coexistence

Look out for the next Polish-German workshops on wolf coexistence hosted by Rewilding Oder Delta. Here is the link to last year's event at which Thorsten spoke: [Dialogue about Wolves – Together for Peaceful Living Alongside – Workshop Invitation](#)

Wolves in human-modified landscapes: Kuijper, D.P.J. et al. (2024). *Wolves recolonize novel ecosystems leading to novel interactions*. *Journal of Applied Ecology*. Available [here](#).

Herbivore behaviour and human vs wolf influence: Boer-Cueva, M. et al. (2026). *Hunting and Outdoor Recreation Affect Large Herbivore Activity Patterns More Than Natural Predators in a Human-Dominated Landscape*. Available [here](#).

Wolf population distribution in Europe: Chapron, G. et al. (2014). *Recovery of large carnivores in Europe's modern human-dominated landscapes*. *Science*, 346(6216), 1517–1519. Available via [Science](#).

EU citizens' attitudes to large carnivore policy: Chapron, G. et al. (2025). *Europeans support large carnivore recovery while opposing both further population growth and hunting*. *Nature Ecology & Evolution*. Available [here](#).

Anti-wolf attitudes as cultural resistance: Krange, O. & Skogen, K. (2011). When the lads go hunting: The 'Hammertown mechanism' and the conflict over wolves in Norway. *Ethnography*, 12(4), 466–489. Available [here](#).

German wolf monitoring

Current wolf distribution data for Germany (monitoring year 2023/24): [Dokumentations- und Beratungsstelle des Bundes zum Thema Wolf \(DBBW\)](#).

EU legal framework – further reading

For the full EU legal background to the downlisting of the wolf, including the Bern Convention amendments, the Habitats Directive changes and the pending CJEU cases (T-634/24 and T-563/25), please see the detailed recaps of the October 2025 ([Part I](#)) and December 2025 ([Part II](#)) Rewilding Law Group calls, and the resources compiled therein, referenced above.

Fleurke, F.M. & Trouwborst, A. (2025). On an anti-wolf mission, Commission ignores science and law. *European Law Blog*. Available [here](#).

Campaigns and petitions

[handsoffnature.eu](#): An EU-wide campaign calling for the protection of EU nature laws (Water Framework Directive, Nature Restoration Law and others) from rollback in the context of

rearmament and budget pressures. Participants were strongly encouraged to sign the petition and share.

Spectrum of Allies – campaign strategy tool

For those working on campaigns around wolf protection or rewilding, the ‘Spectrum of Allies’ framework (referenced in the chat by Annemarie Botzki) is a useful tool for mapping stakeholders and identifying where to focus energy. Available via [350.org training resources](#).

Wildnis Community – independent network

An independent, non-commercial online network for those engaged in nature connection, bushcraft, rewilding and wilderness: [community.wegderwildnis.de](#). An alternative to mainstream social media platforms.

Building relationships – tracking and nature awareness

[Guidelines](#) around responsible wolf tourism

Wildnisschule offering nature connection courses and wolf tracking experiences: [Weg der Wildnis](#) und [Hoher Fläming](#)

[Wolfland Tours](#) - in the East of Germany, close to the Polish border between Berlin and Dresden, run by [Catriona Blum](#) who is a member of the LUPUS Institute, and colleague of Ilka Reinhardt who co-wrote the guidelines for responsible wolf tourism - a very good ethical choice and well set-up for learning tracking, monitoring etc, and a recommended guest house where the tour departs.

Wolf monitoring in the Slovakian Carpathians: [Carpathian Wolf Watch - White Wilderness](#).

Livestock protection and herd defence

For organisations and practitioners working on livestock protection solutions see the LIFEstockProtect page [here](#).

Contact for further resources and collaboration

Participants wishing to share campaign ideas, project links or resources with the group, or to follow up on connections made during the call, can do so via:

rewildingkonferenz@proton.me.

Rewilding Law Hub

More information on rewilding law is available at Lifescape’s [Rewilding Law Hub](#), created in partnership with [Rewilding Europe](#) and [Rewilding Britain](#). **Coming soon, German law rewilding law guidelines – soon to be published on the Rewilding Law Hub.**