The Fund for Animals

1765 P STREET N.W.
WASHINGTON D.C. 20036

STEVE SEATER
Field Director

TELEPHONE
(202) 234-4002
HOME TELEPHONE
(301) 593-0376

1 May 74

Dr. Frank Craighead, President
Environmental Research Institute
Box 156
Moose, Wyoming 83012

Dear Frank:

Sorry to hear about Cowan's reprehensible attitude. Can't really figure out guys like that. If he's a good scientist, he'll only publish his own stuff and not steal someone else's data. I certainly hope John can straighten things out.

Thanks for giving me Dr. Beetle's name. I've heard that he's quite a good fellow. Martha Shell told me that he's been critical of the Cole's work in Grand Teton and Yellowstone involving elk.....so, he's gotta be OK!

The population figure I used in reference to grizzlies came from Schoonmaker's The World of the Grizzly, published by Lippencott. Schoonmaker states that "In the seventeen western states where the grizzly bear formerly existed, the total area, based upon the report of the Geographic Division, Bureau of Census, is about 1,472,105 square miles. One half of this area might be water and other unsuitable habitat. Therefore, the bear might actually have occupied only about 736,053 square miles of this range. If there were two grizzlies on every square mile of its occupied domain, there could have been a total of about 1.5 million grizzly bears in the United States when the white man invaded the West."

Naturally, I realize that Schoonmaker's figure is just a guestimate. One of my buddies at the Smithsonian told me that the figure is worthless and that he calculated there were fewer than 60,000 grizzlies in the West prior to the advent of the white man. He said he based his calculations on the grizzly density figures you and John worked out for Yellowstone Park.

Take care,

Steve

Steve Seater.

ncc/ss

April 25, 1974

Mr. Steve Seater
Field Director
Fund for Animals
1765 P Street, Northwest
Washington, D.C. 20036

Dear Steve:

I have heard of Interior's proposal to list the grizzly bear as an endangered species. The states are now looking into this and I imagine will reply before long.

Cowan has not promised not to publish our data on the bears and so John through the University of Montana, has taken steps to rectify the situation. I talked briefly with Cowan at the Wildlife Conference and discussed this subject with him. I felt better after talking with him but the next letter he sent to John indicated that he planned to go ahead utilizing the privileged data. We'll just have to wait and see.

I'm afraid that I cannot help you much on information relative to overgrazing on BLM lands. I have worked with numerous BLM officials but doubt if you can get this type of information from them. You might write to Dr. Allan Beetle, Professor of Range Ecology, Agricultural Building, University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyoming 82070. He might be able to help you.

BLM is doing some unusually good work such as setting aside the bear trap section of the Madison River as wilderness and establishing refuges for birds of prey near Boise, Idaho. If you should find it necessary to take issue with them on the grazing you might want to add a positive note looking into these commendable actions they have taken.

I have a question I'd like to ask you. In one of your papers you mentioned an early grizzly bear initiated population figure for the North American Continent somewhere in the neighborhood of one million grizzlies. Could you give me this reference?

I hope to meet with the Wyoming Game and Fish Commission to advise them on the grizzly bear and on the grizzly bear hunting season and registration. The department is concerned over the status of the girzzly and has given support to both John andtoo me in our stand on the Yellowstone situation.

Sincerely,

Frank C. Craighead

FCC:mlh

The Fund for Animals

1765 P STREET N.W.
WASHINGTON D.C. 20036

STEVE SEATER
Field Director

TELEPHONE
(202) 234-4002
HOME TELEPHONE
(301) 593-0376

April 12, 1974

Dr. Frank C. Craighead, Jr.
Box 156
Moose, Wyoming 83012

Dear Frank:
How are things going out your way ? Did you see Interior's proposal to list the grizzly bear ? They are now collecting data from the states and any interested persons who might wish to comment on the proposal. So if you know anybody who has an interest and is familiar with the status of the bear in various parts of its range, please get them to comment.

I've heard via the grapevine that our friend Steve Johnson is going about telling people that his position on the grizzly controversy will be vindicated by the NAS report. Apparently he told several Washington based conservationists at the North American Wildlife Conference that Cole's interpretation of the Yellowstone situation would be supported by Cowan et al. I also understand that Johnson knows Starker Leopold and spent a lot of time with him at the North American. I wonder if Leopold would be so foolish as to give Johnson such an idea.

Can you tell me if Cowan ever promised not to publish your data on the bears. I should think by now he would have given his word. Naturally, the Academy's report would have to make reference to some of the data you and John collected, but I don't believe it would be ethical to reproduce large chunks of without permission. Of course if Cowan were to use it in a separate publication of his own, we would have to blast him.

On another subject, I wonder if you know where I can get some current information on overgrazing on BLM lands in your section of the country. I recently testified on the BLM Organic Act now pending before Congress. I ran into a lot of trouble from Representative Melcher on the issue of overgrazing. Melcher denies that any BLM rangelands in Montana, Idaho and Wyoming are overgrazed. I sure would appreciate any help you can give me on this. I hope to get a supplemental statement in before Melcher closes the record.

Best wishes,

Steve

The Fund for Animals

1765 P STREET N.W.
WASHINGTON D.C. 20036

STEVE SEATER
Field Director

TELEPHONE
(202) 234-4002
HOME TELEPHONE
(301) 593-0376

March 13, 1974

Ms. Carol Lumb
Room 452
Old Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C.

Dear Ms. Lumb:

Enclosed is the information you requested on the grizzly controversy. I am sure that if you have looked into this controversy to any degree, you have heard people refer to the Park Service scientists as competent biologists who merely disagree with other competent biologists, the Craigheads. Nothing could be further from the truth.

We have in our possession a deposition taken from Yellowstone's chief biologist, in relation to a suit now pending, in which he admits to having never scientifically observed or censused grizzlies in the Park. Therefore, this man cannot possibly be compared to the Craighead brothers who spent 13 years observing and tracking grizzlies in the backcountry. In truth, he has no competence or expertise, in so far as grizzlies are concerned, and the management plan he has fathered is an abomination.

We are grateful to know that Senator Cranston is interested in pursuing this matter. It is only through the interest of concerned senators and representatives as well as an informed public that we can hope to force Interior to take action to preserve our nation's few remaining grizzlies.

Thank you for your interest.

Sincerely yours,

Steve Seater

Stephen Seater

Encls.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

LEWIS REGENSTEIN, et al., Plaintiffs, v. JACK ANDERSON, et al., Defendants.	Civil Action No. 2193-73

STIPULATION

Defendants, by their attorneys, have requested additional time to answer, move or otherwise plead in the above entitled action and have represented to plaintiffs as follows:

1. A committee of the National Academy of Sciences ("the Academy") is now studying the grizzly bear management program in Yellowstone National Park under contract with the National Park Service;

2. Under the terms of the contract, the Academy study is to be finalized and transmitted to the Department of the Interior on or about May 31, 1974, and it will be made public shortly thereafter;

3. On the basis of the information contained in the Academy study and other information and considerations, defendants intend to transmit to the Council on Environmental Quality a draft environmental impact statement on the Yellowstone Park grizzly bear management program on or about July 1, 1974;

4. In accordance with applicable law and regulations, defendants intend to prepare and transmit to the Council on Environmental Quality as soon thereafter as practicable a final environmental impact statement on the Yellowstone Park grizzly bear management program.

5. Nothing herein shall be used by any party as an admission or as a statement against interest by any party.

As a result of the foregoing representations, plaintiffs agree not to pursue on or before July 1, 1974 any motions or discovery in connection with the above-entitled lawsuit and agree to an extension of defendants' time to answer, move, or otherwise plead until July 1, 1974. In the event defendants transmit to the Council on Environmental Quality a draft environmental impact statement, in accordance with the representation in paragraph 3 above, this action is hereby dismissed.

In the event plaintiffs reactivate this lawsuit, defendants agree to forego any contention that plaintiffs are foreclosed from relief on account of any delay occasioned by this stipulation.

WILLIAM H. RODGERS, JR.
Attorney for Plaintiffs

OF COUNSEL:

ROBERT M. WERDIG, JR.
Attorney for Defendants

SHARON ALLENDER
Office of the Solicitor
U.S. Department of the Interior

Approved:

Dated:

GERHARD A. GESELL
United States District Judge

The Fund for Animals, Inc.
1765 P STREET N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036

TELEPHONE
(202) 234-4002

SUBJECT: Clarification of 25 February 1974 news release on outcome of grizzly bear lawsuit

The Fund for Animals wishes to retract its previous news release on the stipulation agreement filed with Federal Court a few days ago on the Fund's lawsuit, charging that the U.S. Department of Interior and the National Park Service were in violation of the National Environmental Policy Act in carrying out their grizzly bear management program. A copy of the stipulation is enclosed.

The Fund wishes to emphasize that this agreement between the parties in no way represents a concession of illegality on the part of the Government, a reluctance by the Government to litigate this matter, or a determination by the court that the grizzly bear management program was being conducted illegally. The Fund regrets any misconception resulting from its earlier statement interpreting the stipulation as amounting to a concession of illegality by the Government. The Fund also looks forward to reviewing the report of the National Academy of Science (NAS) on the grizzly bear population in Yellowstone National Park, which will provide the scientific basis for part of the information in the Environmental Impact Statement. The NAS study will be available to the public about June 1, 1974.

As the stipulation indicates, the Government has agreed to transmit to the Council on Environmental Quality a draft Environmental Impact Statement on the grizzly bear management program in Yellowstone National Park sometime around July 1, 1974. In response to this representation of good faith by the defendants (who include Secretary of Interior Rogers C.B. Morton, National Park Service Director Ronald Walker, and Superintendant of Yellowstone National Park Jack Anderson), the plaintiffs (including the Fund for Animals and two of its officers) agreed to a dismissal of their lawsuit.

The Fund emphasizes that it was pleased to join with the Government in an agreement on basic principles with respect to the Environmental Impact Statement to be issued on the grizzly bear program in Yellowstone National Park.

The Fund for Animals

1765 P STREET N.W.
WASHINGTON D.C. 20036

STEVE SEATER
Field Director

TELEPHONE
(202) 234-4002
HOME TELEPHONE
(301) 593-0376

January 31, 1974

Mr. David O. Hill
Executive Trustee
Rare Animal Relief Effort
c/o National Audubon Society
950 Third Avenue
New York, New York 10022

Dear Mr. Hill:

Lew has asked that I reply to your inquiry concerning the Yellowstone Grizzly controversy. All I can say is don't be dissuaded from helping the Craigheads by Dick Pough, who hasn't the slightest idea of what is going on in Yellowstone Park. And by all means don't put any credence in Mr. Johnson's article which is merely a summary of Park Service propaganda.

I became involved in the grizzly controversy last winter while still with the World Wildlife Fund. Last March, I left WWF to take a position with Defenders of Wildlife, a group I thought was more militant, and activist. There I continued to study the Yellowstone situation and obtained copies of all the papers published by both the Craigheads and Park Service personnel. Careful analysis showed the Craighead research to be biologically sound and of great value to science. The Park Service research, conducted in large part by Glen Cole, was in contrast a joke. All one need do to verify this is to compare the methodology sections of the two sets of papers. Nowhere in Cole's work is there an explanation of how he was able to distinguish individual bears. Moreover, as you will see in the enclosed letter, he admitted that he never scientifically censused the Yellowstone grizzly population. Therefore, his population estimates are false and have unfortunately been used to cloud the issue and discredit the fine work of the Craigheads.

All of this will be apparent to anyone who takes the time to carefully study both sets of data. Tom Garrett of Friends of the Earth has also analyzed this data. He independently arrived at the same conclusion I did: The Park Service is frantically generating false data to justify a bureaucratic decision which proved to be a terrible disaster.

I became incensed about the whole affair last last Spring and decided to write some articles on the subject. Subsequently, I had an article published in Environmental Quality magazine and one in Defenders of Wildlife News. I followed these articles

up with letters to key members of Congress asking them to look into what was going on in Yellowstone. As the pressure mounted, the Assistant Secretary of Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Nathaniel P. Reed, complained to influential members of the DOW Board of Directors. The direct result of Mr. Reed's interference was my abrupt dismissal. I do not know exactly what Reed told the Directors he contacted but I do know it threw the entire Board into a state of confusion.

Now it so happens that Defenders has been buying up land near Tucson, Arizona to ostensibly preserve a choice piece of riparian habitat known as Aravaipa Canyon. The purchase of these rather large tracts of land was made possible by a bequest from the Whittell Estate. This sudden inheritance of large amounts of money was accompanied by what one of DOW's former Directors has termed "a profound and quite forceful change in the organization's leadership". To be quite frank, the new leadership seems intent on keeping DOW out of the major conservation fights and involved in buying land in Arizona.

It is interesting to note that the main section of Aravaipa Canyon is public domain administered by the Bureau of Land Management and has enjoyed a good measure of protection since 1969 when it was designated a primitive area. Oddly, the land purchased by DOW, instead of including the central and biologically speaking most important section of Aravaipa Canyon, is comprised of separate tracts at the east and west entrances to the Canyon. And DOW is now attempting to buy up the rest of the land surrounding Aravaipa, but it is doubtful that this will be accomplished within the near future.

Ian McMillan, a well-known conservationist and former member of the DOW Board has characterized the Aravaipa purchases as "a widely scattered land and livestock project in Arizona". Several other people whose names I cannot reveal have corroborated this observation. And I will add that the purpose of the Aravaipa project was never articulated in a satisfactory manner during all the months that I was employed by Defenders. Moreover, I know for a fact that a few Directors are opposed to the project but are outvoted by the dominant clique headed by Dick Pough.

At any rate, immediately following purchase of the Aravaipa lands, DOW acted, at the behest of the dominant clique, to cut off access to the main section of the Canyon. Naturally, BLM protested this action since the Canyon itself is public land; and they subsequently threatened to condemn a right-of-way through the DOW purchases. This prompted Pough and his friends to by-pass the state BLM administrators and begin top-level negotiations with officials in Washington.

Now I know for a fact that Nat Reed is personally involved in the Yellowstone grizzly debacle. According to freelance writer Martha Shell, Reed claimed he personally ordered the largest dump in Yellowstone closed. My attack on the Park Service put Reed's reputation in jeopardy and prompted him to lobby influencial DOW Directors. Now it is my theory that the dominant clique of Directors feared that Reed's anger would upset their negotations with BLM, so they ordered my dismissal. Some of the more responsible Directors have admitted that this is probably what happened.

To assuage Reed, the dominant clique sent A.S. Johnson to Yellowstone Park to gather information to write a rebuttal of my grizzly article which appeared in the August issue of DOW News. Johnson, a former junior high school teacher who had photographed a few grizzlies in the past, once worked as a ranger in GrandTeton National Park where he is said to have had an office adjacent to Glen Cole's. Moreover, it is well known that he supported the Park Service's management of grizzlies long before he went to Yellowstone on his "fact" finding mission. I never expected his article to be objective but when I read it I must admit to being flabbergasted. His conclusions are almost word for word what Cole has said in various papers attempting to justify Park policy. In fact, one mistake of Cole's was picked up and used by Johnson. Had he done his homework and carefully analyzed the Craighead data he would have detected this error.

Where Defenders has failed, the Fund for Animals has succeeded. We have managed to get nationwide publicity for this issue and we are presently suing the National Park Service for failure to issue an environmental impact statement on the Yellowstone program. We are also pressing for Congressional hearings on the Park Service's management of bears in all of the Parks. Additionally, we have petitioned the U.S. Forest Service to close the hunting season on grizzlies in the forests surrounding Yellowstone and we will soon be petitioning the Department of the Interior to place this vanishing creature on its list of native endangered species.

In closing, I strongly urge you to turn a deaf ear to the protests of Mr. Pough and issue a grant to Frank Craighead to help him carry out his campaign to vindicate his position on the Yellowstone grizzly. Believe me, no one anywhere in the world has conducted such worthwhile and original research on grizzly bears as have Frank and John Craighead. They deserve your support.

Sincerely yours,

Stephen R. Seater

Stephen R. Seater
Field Director

The Fund for Animals

1765 P STREET N.W.
WASHINGTON D.C. 20036

STEVE SEATER
Field Director

TELEPHONE
(202) 234-4002
HOME TELEPHONE
(301) 593-0376

February 12, 1974

The Honorable Julia Butler Hansen
Chairwoman
Subcommittee On Interior And
Related Agencies
U. S. House of Representatives
Washington, D. C. 20515

Dear Madame Chairman:

The Subcommittee On Interior And Related Agencies will soon be scheduling hearings to examine the National Park Service's proposed budget for fiscal year 1974-1975. It would be of great interest to all those concerned about the well-being of the National Parks if you and the other members of the subcommittee would question Park Service representatives about what appear to be numerous examples of bad management and possible violations of federal statutes and regulations.

Because the Fund for Animals is a wildlife conservation organization primarily interested in the survival and humane treatment of wild creatures, we would first like to call your attention to the grizzly bear extermination campaign now being waged by the National Park Service (NPS) in Yellowstone National Park. In the space of some five years, the NPS "management" program in Yellowstone has succeeded in destroying half of the grizzly bear population and may have resulted in the death of a camper, the first bear-caused fatality since 1916.

Probably the most scandalous aspect of this controversy is the way NPS and Assistant Secretary Reed have attempted to keep all meetings of the Natural Sciences Advisory Committee closed to the public, despite the fact that federal regulations require them to be open.

Another disturbing development is the Park Service's refusal to complete and release an environmental impact statement on their management program as required by the National Environmental Policy Act. This brazen disregard for the law does nothing to win support for the NPS program.

Several months ago, Drs. John and Frank Craighead - the world's foremost authorities on grizzly bears - submitted their comprehensive computerized grizzly report to the Department of the Interior for review. Interior refused to provide copies to the public or allow anyone to study it in offices of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, where it was being reviewed by wildlife biologists. Not even U. S. Congressmen who requested the document were allowed to see a copy until about mid-December. Since this document is not classified material, it appears that the refusal to release it to the public is a violation of the Freedom of Information Act. We requested copies of this report in September and October of last year but as of this writing we have received nothing from Interior.

The Craighead report takes strong exception to the extermination program presently underway within Yellowstone and predicts the possible extinction of the grizzly bear there before the year 2000. This then explains why the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, which is also under Mr. Reed's direction, has been so reluctant to release the report.

Naturally, NPS has claimed that its program in Yellowstone is based upon scientific data collected by its bear biologist Glen Cole. Interestingly enough, however, Mr. Cole admitted, in a deposition taken in connection with the suit now pending against NPS, that he had never scientifically censused grizzlies in Yellowstone as had the Craighead brothers. The simple truth is: NPS has no valid scientific data upon which to base their grizzly management program and the public has been deceived.

The enclosed material should serve to illustrate the largely avoidable tragedy that has befallen Yellowstone's grizzlies. Unfortunately, even the mass of data our organization has amassed, showing the grizzly population in the lower 48 states to be dwindling rapidly, has not been enough to make Interior list this beleagured species as endangered.

As you know, the Organic Act of 1916 mandates NPS to preserve wildlife in the parks in such manner and by such means as will leave it "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." Clearly then, the Park Service's responsibility is to the bears first and the people second. When conflicts occur, NPS should regulate the people and not the bears.

Unfortunately, this is not what is happening in our parks today. Instead of preserving the parks, NPS prefers to develop them.

"Parks are for people" is the NPS slogan and when the agency must choose between bears and people, it is the bears who must go.

A recent article in the San Jose Mercury revealed that a total of 307 black bears were killed in Yosemite National Park from 1960-1972. It is hard to believe that all 307 were incorrigible animals which posed a threat to human safety.

Conservationists are also greatly disturbed by the accelerated development that has occurred within the parks in recent years. In fact there seems to be a distinct erosion of the principles set forth in the Organic Act. Rather than standing firm for preservation of park values, NPS has become identified with active development which is resulting in a loss of natural beauty and the destruction of wildlife.

It has recently been learned that NPS has decided to permit a massive development and construction program on the South Rim of the Grand Canyon, totalling at least $5,000,000. The thirty year contract with concessioner Fred Harvey, Inc., calls for the construction of several employee residence halls, cafeterias, gift shops, a cocktail lounge, and a trailer camp. A second contract was negotiated with a landscaping firm for comprehensive design procedures and site selection on the South Rim. Both contracts were signed prior to publication of either a Master Plan or a Development Concept Plan called for by Park Service administrative policy. Moreover, an environmental impact statement was not prepared, as required by the National Environmental Policy Act for all major and controversial actions affecting the environment. Even though, NPS is now preparing the documents, the existence of several contracts make their actions seem as after-the-fact justifications.

Another disturbing situation is the Park Service's failure to reject the proposal to allow runway expansion in Grand Teton National Park to accomodate commercial jet aircraft. Commercial aircraft of this kind will cause extreme noise and air pollution, greatly reducing wilderness values and disturbing wildlife now enjoyed by over three million visitors a year. It is hard to understand the rationale for expanding the present airport facilities for commercial purposes when the law states that airports may be allowed in National Parks when they are determined to be "necessary to proper performance of the functions of the Department of the Interior." In recognition of the purposes and functions of National Parks, the Department of Transportation, the President's

Council on Environmental Quality and the Environmental Protection Agency have opposed expansion of the airport. The question which should be asked is why does NPS continue to remain silent?

Yet another disturbing situation involves the decision to permit expansion of mechanized ski facilities in Lassen Volcanic National Park in what is almost certainly a violation of the Organic Act. This decision was also made in violation of the Council on Environmental Quality's Guidelines issued to federal agencies, calling for environmental impact statements to be prepared and released to the public before any decisions are made to undertake major federal actions. Reports persist that similar plans exist to expand or "upgrade" ski facilities in Yosemite National Park.

The construction of mass recreation facilities and golf courses are clearly incompatible with the National Park concept, as enunciated by John Muir, Theodore Roosevelt and other giants of the conservation movement, and have long been opposed by conservationists. In the 1963 report of the Advisory Board on Wildlife Management, the Board members urged the Park Service "to reverse its policy of permitting these nonconforming uses, and to liquidate them as expeditiously as possible." Moreover, the Second World Conference on National Parks held just one year ago at Grand Teton and Yellowstone urged that such incompatible development be excluded from all national parks.

Finally, we think it would be appropriate to ask NPS what plans exist to implement the enlightened recommendations for park management put forth in the Conservation Foundation's report "National Parks for the Future" and the report of the National Parks Centennial Commission.

If you desire further information on any of the topics contained in this letter, please don't hesitate to notify me.

Thank you for considering our views.

Respectfully Yours,

Stephen R. Seater

Stephen R. Seater
Field Director

Enclosures

The Fund for Animals

1765 P STREET N.W.
WASHINGTON D.C. 20036

STEVE SEATER
Field Director

TELEPHONE
(202) 234-4002
HOME TELEPHONE
(301) 593-0376

February 14, 1974

Mr. Mike Tharp
The Wall Street Journal
1233 Regal Row
Dallas, Texas 75247

Dear Mr. Tharp:

Since Mr. Regenstein has already sent you a considerable amount of information regarding the details of the Park Service's "management" or extermination program, I will confine my remarks to other aspects of this scandalous situation. It is sad, but unfortunately true, that the National Park Service (NPS) and the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Nathaniel P. Reed, are guilty of numerous violations of federal law and regulations in their frantic attempts to conceal the truth about the program in Yellowstone.

First of all, there has been no Environmental Impact Statement prepared on the grizzly management plan, even though federal agencies are mandated to prepare an EIS on all actions they undertake which significantly affect the environment. As a result of this dereliction of duty, the Fund for Animals was forced to begin legal proceedings to compel NPS to prepare the required document.

It is equally distressing that all Park Service Natural Sciences Advisory Committee meetings dealing with the Yellowstone situation have been closed to the public despite federal regulations requiring such meetings to be open (Freedom of Information Act, President Nixon's Executive Order #11672).

According to Martha Shell, a freelance writer, based in Kansas City, Mo., she was barred from attending an important Advisory Committee meeting held in Seattle, Washington. It was only after the intervention of her congressman that Secretary of the Interior, Rogers C.B. Morton ordered the meeting open. Mr. Reed, however, responded by suddenly changing the site of the meeting in an effort to make attendance by Mrs. Shell impossible. Luckily, Mrs. Shell met one of the fish and game commissioners who was to attend and he advised her of the new meeting place. It might be worthwhile for you to contact Mrs. Shell about NPS secrecy and other bureaucratic malfeasance. She has accumulated more data on the Yellowstone tragedy than any of the other principal critics of the NPS program. She may be reached at 816-444-6487.

Another shocking situation that should be covered in an article is the way Drs. Frank and John Craighead - the foremost authorities on the grizzly bears - have been treated by Mr. Reed and NPS. Their research and recommendations have been misquoted, disparaged and even suppressed. Their massive "Computer Analysis of the Yellowstone Grizzly Bear Population", which represents 13 years of intensive research, was suppressed by Interior, until just recently, because it found fault with the NPS "management" plan in Yellowstone. The Fund for Animals was seriously considering a suit under the Freedom of Information Act to dislodge the Craighead report.

Even more shocking than the suppression of public information, is the way NPS attempted to renegotiate the Craighead's research contract in Yellowstone. So many restrictions were placed on their research and their right to publish their findings, that it became obvious that scientific research in the Park was no longer possible. Thus in 1970, after 13 years of intensive research on grizzly bears, black bears and elk, the Craigheads were forced to leave the Park. According to Frank Craighead, the Yellowstone administration, under Jack Anderson, ordered the Craighead laboratory obliterated. The loss in equipment was considerable, as you can imagine. The building which housed the lab was not even Park Service property, but instead belonged to a concessionaire.

Secretary Reed and NPS have done everything in their power to silence those who disagree with their management of grizzly bears. In my case, Mr. Reed lobbied one or more influential Directors of Defenders of Wildlife to "quiet me down." He succeeded in creating great confusion at the Board level; and the influential Directors he complained to ultimately prevailed and I was fired without so much as a day's notice. Mr. Reed later admitted to a friend of mine that he had called Mrs. Margaret Owings of the DOW Board to see if she would exert her influence to get me off his back. Naturally, he now denies that he ever wanted me dismissed. That may be true, but when an Assistant Secretary of the Interior complains to friends in high position within a private organization, it often results in drastic action being taken. Fortunately, I was quickly hired by the Fund, which believes in speaking out on issues of this sort, whatever the cost.

Since my abrupt dismissal, DOW sent a man to Yellowstone - a former Park Service employee reputed to be a friend of Park biologist Glen Cole and Park Superintendant Jack Anderson, and who had already gone on record as supporting the present program - to ostensibly investigate the situation and write an article for the DOW News presenting the "facts" of the controversy. His article appeared in the December issue of the News and makes a crude attempt to refute what I had previously written in support of the Craighead position. Careful scrutiny of Mr. Johnson's article led me to the inescapable conclusion that he either relied almost exclusively on Glen Cole, Yellowstone's Chief biologist, when he wrote the piece, or he merely combined and reworded Cole's last two publications in preparing his article. Johnson even incorporated one of Cole's errors concerning cub mortality, in his article. Cole mistakenly stated that the Craighead research showed a 39 percent death rate of cubs prior to the closure of the dumps. This figure is actually 30 percent and was derived from data the Craigheads had collected over a thirteen-year period. And, I might add, it is not possible for Cole to have independently arrived at the 39 percent figure since, prior

to the closure of the dumps, the Park Service conducted absolutely no research on grizzly bears. All this suggests that had Mr. Johnson been objective and read the Craighead reports, instead of relying on Mr. Cole's fudged data, he would never have incorporated the erroneous 39 percent figure in his DOW article.

It is also interesting to note that nowhere in his article did Johnson discuss scientific methodology. If you compare Cole's methodology with that of the Craigheads, you will see that NPS has never scientifically censused the grizzlies in Yellowstone. In fact, we have learned that Mr. Cole admitted, in sworn testimony, that he never scientifically censused grizzlies or did any backcountry studies similar to those of the Craigheads (see my letter to Mr. Robinson, copy enclosed).

In my opinion, the Johnson article is a combination of improper use of scientific data; juggling of figures; misrepresentation of the work of others; and failure to include pertinent data, all for the express purpose of discrediting the work of two great scientists who spent thirteen years studying grizzly bears and who received more than $1 million in grants to conduct their research.

The results of the NPS extermination program have been tragic indeed. As of this writing, nearly half of the Yellowstone grizzlies have been wiped out and at least one, possibly two, human deaths can be attributed to the program. In the case of the documented human fatality, that of Harry Eugene Walker, the Park Service has been charged with gross negligence by the attorneys for the boy's parents. I urge you to write or call them for details pertaining to the case. There is a great deal of scandal involved that should be made public. Contact Zetterberg and Zetterberg, Attorneys at Law, 319 Harvard Avenue, Claremont, California 91711. 714-621-2971.

Should you require additional information, please don't hesitate to call me.

Sincerely yours,

Steve Seater

Stephen R. Seater
Staff Biologist

The Fund for Animals

1765 P STREET N.W.
WASHINGTON D.C. 20036

STEVE SEATER
Field Director

TELEPHONE
(202) 234-4002
HOME TELEPHONE
(301) 593-0376

January 1974

NEWS RELEASE

SUBJECT: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR AND WESTERN FISH AND GAME COMMISSIONS ACCUSED OF THREATENING EXTINCTION OF BIGHORN SHEEP BY ENCOURAGING EXCESSIVE TROPHY HUNTING

FOR RELEASE: UPON RECEIPT

SUMMARY: THE INTERIOR DEPARTMENT'S BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT AND THE FISH AND GAME COMMISSIONS OF MONTANA, IDAHO, WYOMING AND COLORADO WERE CHARGED TODAY WITH SPECIFIC RESPONSIBILITY IN PUSHING THE RARE ROCKY MOUNTAIN BIGHORN SHEEP TOWARD EXTINCTION.

THE BASIS FOR THIS CHARGE IS THAT THE ABOVE FISH AND GAME AGENCIES HAVE PERMITTED AND ENCOURAGED THE SHOOTING BY TROPHY HUNTERS OF THE LARGEST AND MOST GENETICALLY FIT RAMS IN THE BIGHORN HERDS. THIS REMOVES THE STRONGEST AND MOST FIT SHEEP, WHICH ADVERSELY AFFECTS THE EVOLUTIONARY DEVELOPMENT OF THE SPECIES AND DISRUPTS THEIR HIGHLY COMPLEX AND SOCIAL STRUCTURE. MOREOVER, BY ISSUING EXCESSIVE NUMBERS OF GRAZING PERMITS TO RANCHERS, THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT IS ALLOWING VITAL HABITAT TO BE DESTROYED BY DOMESTIC LIVESTOCK WHICH COMPETE WITH BIGHORNS FOR GRASS.

THE FUND FOR ANIMALS - A NATIONAL CONSERVATION AND ANIMAL PROTECTION ORGANIZATION - WARNED THAT UNLESS THESE GOVERNMENT AGENCIES TAKE STEPS TO PROTECT THE BIGHORN SHEEP, THE FUTURE SURVIVAL OF ANIMAL WILL BE PLACED IN DOUBT.

for further information, please
contact Steve Seater (202)234-4002

A warning was issued today that the magnificent Rocky Mountain bighorn sheep is threatened with extinction by Federal and state wildlife "management" policies. The main danger to the bighorn is a combination of exploitive land-use practices and psuedo-scientific "game management" policies which encourage trophy hunters to kill the largest, most important breeding rams, according to The Fund for Animals - a national conservation organization.

Urged on by a declining number of trophy-sized sheep and a lack of even rudimentary sportsmanship, big game hunters seek the few large rams now remaining in the mountain wilderness of the west by any means available, including helicopters and airplanes. The destructive practice of taking the largest genetically fit males is encouraged by the 3/4 curl regulation - adopted by the fish and game commissions of Montana, Idaho, Wyoming and Colorado - that permits rams to be shot whose horns have grown to form three-quarters of a circle. Under this rule, rams as young as three years can be legally taken. Since scientific studies have shown that rams do not contribute to the genetics of the herd until they are eight years old, this means the remaining herds are being robbed of their most effective breeders.

Wildlife biologist and bighorn sheep expert James K. Morgan, who has studied bighorns in Idaho for five years, says there is no scientific evidence to substantiate the claim that killing the

- over -

largest rams does not have a deleterious effect on the sheep. In fact, in a recent magazine article, Mr. Morgan stated that, "Data collected from hunter kills over a four-year period revealed that...the 3/4 curl regulation did not remove old rams whose usefulness to the herd was past; rather, it concentrated hunting pressure on the largest young rams and the large-horned, actively breeding rams." Other responsible scientists also oppose trophy hunting of bighorns because it disrupts the social stability of the herds.

Bighorn social structure is complex and fascinating. Each year the animals migrate from summer to winter ranges, following traditional migration routes. Migration appears necessary to the health of bighorns because it forces them to disperse periodically, thereby lessening the incidence of parasitic infestation which is known to increase when the animals are crowded together. Biologists believe that once the migration tradition is lost, it can never be regained. Rams have been observed to vacate traditional ranges after being fired upon by hunters. Many never return to their erstwhile haunts, thus denying vital habitat to future generations of bighorns.

Each fall, hormonal activity triggers the breeding urge in bighorns as they begin their winter migration. The rams take part in dominance contests by engaging in prodigious head butting bouts. Mountain valleys echo with the awesome cracking sounds made by adult rams as they collide head on. The winners of the jousts move up the social ladder and eventually breed with most of the available ewes. In this way, the strongest and most fit rams make the largest contribution ot the herd's gene pool; and nature's law of natural selection and survival of the fittest is fulfilled.

Poaching of trophy-sized bighorns presents a major threat to the species. A prominent California hunting guide was indicted by the Grand Jury in 1971, along with a well known-taxidermy firm, for selling rare bighorn heads to wealthy hunters for a handsome profit. Head-hunting for big money has become a lucrative business and is widespread throughout the west. Not only bighorns are taken by unscrupulous hunters, but other beleaguered species such as bison and grizzly bears fall prey to illegal trophy hunting. Poaching will remain a threat to endangered wildlife because fines are a mere $500.00 and rich clients pay thousands of dollars for a prize specimen.

State fish and game commissions are largely to blame for the trophy hunting fiasco which appears to be dooming the bighorn.

These bureaucracies and their biologists - who are too often subservient to pressure from the hunting lobby - steadfastly refuse to recognize the dangers involved in allowing the most vigorous males to be culled from the herds. Yet, sufficient data exists on this kind of hunting in other species to serve as a warning of what lies ahead for bighorn sheep if these unsound practices are allowed to continue.

Famed German zoologist Paul Leyhausen has pointed out that considerable evidence exists suggesting that male elephants now carry less ivory than they once did as a result of counter selection exerted by shooting animals with the largest tusks. Also, the policy of shooting males only has virtually destroyed the European roe deer, which today is a mere shadow of the majestic creature it once was. Furthermore, it is well known that certain highly social ungulates (hooved animals) cannot withstand heavy hunting pressure, since it breaks down their social cohesion and disrupts their territoriality.

Sharing a large part of the blame for the senseless slaughter of bighorn sheep are the big game trophy clubs such as the Boone and Crockett Club, which claim to be pro-conservation, but at the same time reward hunters, through a point system, who kill the largest, most vigorous specimens. It is imperative that Boone and Crockett and similar clubs cease glorifying the slaughter of prime mountain sheep by putting a halt to encouraging "sportsmen" to kill the most actively breeding rams.

The counter selective pressure exerted by trophy hunting will ultimately reduce horn size of bighorns and produce an abundance of genetically inferior rams. This may have already happened in at least one state. Morgan's five year study of the intensively hunted bighorn herd on the Middle Forks of the Salmon River revealed that the animals have been declining for years; yet there is no competition from livestock, nor has their habitat been grossly disturbed.

Fund Staff Biologist, Steve Seater, in Washington D.C., called the present management practices "a legalized betrayal of the basic principles of wildlife biology and conservation that should be terminated without further ado. With only about ten percent of the bighorn's original population surviving today, we simply cannot afford the trophymania that is robbing the bighorn herds of the best rams. State fish and game commissions must stop catering to well-heeled hunters and begin to take seriously their responsibility to protect the

- over -

bighorn." Mr. Seater, in a letter to Assistant Secretary of the Interior Nathaniel P. Reed, urged the Department of the Interior to immediately place the Rocky Mountain bighorn sheep on its list of native endangered fish and wildlife, and to take all possible steps to protect these threatened creatures.

During the last century, bighorns have undergone a precipitous decline owing in large part to unwise land-use practices permitted by BLM on the nation's publicly-owned lands. Overgrazing by privately-owned cattle and sheep has destroyed much of the grass bighorns and other wildlife depend upon for survival. In many areas where grass once grew, today only sagebrush can be seen.

The Interior Department's Bureau of Land Management, the agency charged with the responsibility of administering the public lands in the West, has contributed significantly to the decline of bighorn sheep as a result of management practices which primarily benefit privately-owned domestic livestock. Each year, BLM issues permits which allow excessive numbers of sheep and cattle to graze on the public lands. This practice has had catastrophic environmental effects including accelerated soil erosion, deterioration of water quantity and quality and the reduction of wildlife, with the bighorn serving as the classic example. "BLM has forgotten that the public lands belong to all Americans and not just to the livestock interests. It is time for all concerned Americans to pressure BLM to manage our public lands in a sound ecological manner. Unless immediate action is taken to improve bighorn habitat and curtail trophy hunting," warned Seater, "the species' decline toward extinction cannot be halted.

LATE NOTE

On December 28, 1973 President Nixon signed into law the Endangered Species Act of 1973. The new act generally gives the Department of the Interior much greater power and flexibility in taking whatever steps are necessary to protect rare and endangered species, including: closing the hunting season on such species in the various states; having government agencies, such as BLM, conform to the purposes and policies of the act; and providing a list of and protecting not only species presently in danger of extinction throughout all or a significant portion of their range, but also of those species likely to become endangered in the foreseeable future.

February 15, 1974

Mr. Steven R. Seater
Field Director
Fund for Animals
1765 "P" Street, N.W.
Washington D.C. 20036

COPY

Dear Steve:

I read with interest your very informative letter of January 31 to Mr. David O. Hill. I was interested to learn that Mr. Pough is opposed to our stand on the grizzly bear as well as to helping me with a grant on this grizzly bear controversy. I would very much like to discuss the subject with him sometime. Perhaps I could help to change his mind with a few letters and some factual data. I received a letter from him before getting this one off. I did not know that the ~~Fund for Animals~~ was considering giving a grant that would help me in this work, although I have been soliciting donations to Environmental Research Institute for this cause and have been helped in this undertaking by Paul Buser.

I have had to turn down an offer to attend a meeting in Cheyenne of the Grizzly Bear Committee of the International. Travel cost was about $200.00.

I am one of seven American delegates attending the Moscow Theriological Congress in June, to give a paper on, "Grizzly Bear Biology and Management", at the Bear Management Symposium. Our group had anticipated travel support from the Office of Naval Research, but due to last minute budgetary problems, we have just learned that this support will not be forthcoming. My expenses for this trip from Wyoming to Moscow and return will run somewhere between one thousand and fifteen hundred dollars. I would leave Jackson in June and present this same paper at the Third International Bear Management Symposium held in connection with the meeting of the American Society of Mammologists in Binghamton, New York. The papers given here will be comprehensive and will be published in a monograph. From this meeting my plans were to fly to Moscow for the June 6 through 12 meetings.

A paper will be given at this meeting on, "Bear Management in National Parks". I feel that it is particularly important at this time to present the biology of the mountain grizzly and treat the management or lack of management occurring in the past. I plan to present a sensible approach to management of this endangered species in the future. If you know of any organization that might be interested in helping me to defray the expenses of this trip, I would greatly appreciate information that would enable me to contact them.

I greatly appreciate the support that you and your organization have given to my brother and me in this controversy. I feel that you should have whatever information we can supply to help support your stand. Recently I received a copy of a letter sent to Dr. Cowan. I imagine that in one way or another this will eventually be released, if not for publication, then at least for perusal. This letter by Mr. Reynolds is a frank and honest assessment of the situation and fully jibes with my own knowledge and experience. I am sending you a copy for your own information, but I cannot give you permission to publish this or even parts of it and would certainly be upset if you did without obtaining the permission of Mr. Reynolds, and until Dr. Cowan makes some reference to it, I don't think it would be wise to reveal this to the Park Service at this time. Mr. Reynolds, who sent me this copy, indicated that once Dr. Cowan responded to it, I could use it in whatever way I thought would be most beneficial. Never-the-less, at this time, I am sending it to you only for your own information and possibly discussion with others. It looks as though I will be called as a witness in the case dealing with the death of the Walker boy by a grizzly. I am busy reviewing field notes and compiling information that I feel will be needed when I testify.

Sincerely,

Frank Craighead

Enclosure:

FCC/pw

COPY

February 4, 1974

Mr. Steve Seater
Fund for Animals
Washington, D.C.

COPY

Dear Steve:

I appreciated getting the copy of the article by Steve Johnson. It would be useless to reply in detail to this, but I am sending you a copy of a short note I sent to Steve.

Incidentally, he spent weeks I believe with Park Service personnel, part of a day with me and didn't meet with John. While here, it was obvious to me that he was already commited to the Park Service views - possibly becuase he would like to get a job with them. This had been my impression when getting together with him at an earlier time. I let him read that early letter of Mr. Regenstein's so that he would realize that other people had a pretty good idea of what was going on and that he need not get all of his information on our side of the controversy from us alone. I told him that he could read, but not have, a copy of the letter. When he left he walked off with my only copy and returned it some weeks later. No doubt he made a copy.

Sincerely,

Frank C. Craighead

Enclosure:

FCC/pw

January 11, 1974

Steve Seater
Funds for Animals
Washington, D.C.

Dear Steve:

I enjoyed our phone conversation the other night and was very much interested in your suggestion that we collaborate on some research projects where you could be helpful in raising funds.

I discussed the wildlife satellite tracking and monitoring program with John and both of us decided that it is probably a little early to go all out on obtaining funding on these projects. I think we are going to have to wait a bit and see just what direction NASA plans to go. However, I am sending you a one page statement briefly abstracting the type of project I think might be worth considering. In addition to this we have permission to use the Nimbus 6 satellite for tracking of grizzly bear and elk. We are exploring the possibilities of transplanting grizzlies into parts of Montana as well as parts of Wyoming and tracking them by satellite. Hopefully this can be done before too long but there are some political aspects to be ironed out as well as some technical developments that need further perfection.

I am currently working with Joel Varney through a small contract with NASA and a grant from the National Geographic Society to develop and test an ultra high frequency transmitter for use on birds. This will be compatible with satellite frequencies and will be very valuable for studies of rare and endangered bird species worldwide.

Another project that I would like to see get underway this spring is a nesting census and productivity study of raptors on a 12 square mile area here in Wyoming. This would be done in order to compare it with a similar census made some 25 years ago.

COPY

I am including a short statement on this pwoposal. It would take I believe in the neighborhood of about $15,000.to fund this study for the coming year.

As soon as possible I will try to send you a copy of the letter that I mentioned to you by phone. Hope all is going well and look forward to seeing you before too long.

Sincerely,

Frank Craighead Jr.

FC/mh

COPY

The Fund for Animals

18 January 1974

1765 P STREET N.W.
WASHINGTON D.C. 20036

LEWIS REGENSTEIN
Executive Vice-President

TELEPHONE
(202) 234-4002

NEWS RELEASE

SUBJECT: BAN ON GRIZZLY BEAR HUNTING IN THE NATIONAL FORESTS SOUGHT BY ENVIRONMENTALISTS TRYING TO SAVE SPECIES FROM EXTINCTION.

SUMMARY: Secretary of Agriculture Earl Butz and Forest Service Chief John McGuire were today formally petitioned to halt the hunting of the gravely-threatened grizzly bear population in the national forests surrounding Yellowstone National Park and which form an integral part of the Yellowstone eco-system.

Combined with the large-scale killing of grizzly bears in Yellowstone Park carried out by the National Park Service (see enclosed news release of October 1973), the continued hunting of grizzlies in the national forests of Wyoming and Montana (the only remaining states other than Alaska where viable grizzly populations still exist) is steadily pushing this species towards extinction in the lower 48 states. Moreover, the hunting in Montana is virtually unrestricted, with the state issuing between 900-1,600 grizzly bear hunting permits each year, a figure representing more than the total number of grizzlies remaining in the entire lower 48 states !

The groups joining the Fund for Animals in this petition included the Animal Protection Institute of America, Environmental Action, and Friends of the Earth. These conservation organizations expressed their deep gratitude to Professor William H. Rodgers, Jr., and to Mr. David L. Thomas, Jr., of Georgetown University Law Center, who prepared the petition on a voluntary basis.

This petition is the latest round in a series of efforts by the Fund for Animals to save the grizzly from extinction. On 18 December 1973, the Fund filed a lawsuit against Secretary of Interior Rogers Morton, National Park Service Director Ronald Walker, and Superintendant of Yellowstone Park Jack Anderson, charging that they are in violation of the National Environmental Policy Act in carrying out their "grizzly bear management" program in Yellowstone, because they continue to refuse to issue an environmental impact statement. This "management" plan has managed to exterminate perhaps half of Yellowstone's grizzlies, and is a primary cause of the greatly depleted and threatened status of these animals.

for further information, please contact: Lewis Regenstein or Steve Seater, (202) 234-4002