

From: [Bean, Michael](#)
To: [Robert Aland](#)
Subject: Re: GRIZZLY BEARS - AND CECIL THE (FORMER) AFRICAN LION
Date: Monday, August 03, 2015 4:22:27 PM

Thank you, Mr. Aland.

On Mon, Aug 3, 2015 at 1:01 PM, Robert Aland <raland@comcast.net> wrote:

Dear Messrs. Bean, Ashe and Thabault and Ms. Fahey:

Decent people around the world are outraged by the assassination of Cecil, the iconic male lion in Zimbabwe, by the cowardly American trophy hunter, Dr. Walter Palmer, who paid the money; shot the arrow and the bullets; asserts that all was "proper and legal"; and blames his guides/outfitters. To make matters worse, if that's possible, today there is a report of another lion assassination in Zimbabwe in April by a Pennsylvania doctor, Jan Seski.

Cecil was lured outside a protected area; wounded by an arrow; killed by a gun two days later after much suffering; beheaded for a wall decoration (with fierce expression, of course); and left to rot.

The US Fish & Wildlife Service, correctly but cynically, according to a newspaper report, is "investigating the circumstances surrounding the killing." I say "cynically" because I do not remember any instance in which FWS has expressed much interest, much less outrage, with regard to the illegal killing of a protected species in this country. Where was FWS when the spectacular ESA-protected male grizzly bear was killed by three "hunters" claiming "self-defense" on Thanksgiving Day 2012 in Grand Teton National Park. FWS's silence in response to that outrageous killing was deafening, apparently FWS concluded that public relations did not require anything more than silence.

I write to say that the assassination of Cecil is indistinguishable from the fate that many grizzly bears will suffer if their ESA protection is removed, a result that I will do everything within my power to prevent even though I am well aware of the imbalance of leverage between an individual and a federal agency such as FWS, which has unlimited human and financial resources and litigation advantages (such as the sanctity of the Administrative Record, which has been seriously abused by FWS since *Overton Park*, a matter that I will be pleased to discuss with you) free of concern about expenditures of taxpayers' money.

The only conceivable "reasons," all bad, to remove ESA protection for grizzly bears are (a) appease "hunters" (probably including Dr. Palmer and Dr. Seski) and outfitters, who no doubt are salivating over the prospect of killing grizzly bears for fun and profit, respectively; (b) appease ranchers who lose a few animals to the bears while grazing (usually at bargain prices on federal lands) but generally receive some level of reimbursement; (c) allow access by resource exploiters to the bears' critical habitat; and (d) validate the careers of FWS personnel who have been entrusted with the great bears' fates.

There are no other reasons. The bears are not (a) too numerous as some argue is the case for deer in certain urban and suburban areas or (b) needed by hunters for food as some argue is the case for elk and deer.

The sole delisting motivation (other, possibly, states' rights issues reminiscent of the Old South where I grew up) is to allow the great bears to be killed as envisioned by the "management" plans of Idaho, Montana and Wyoming; all indicate that the number of GYA bears will be

reduced to 500. Are you familiar with those "management" plans and the "harvesting" they allow?

This brings me back to the analogy between Cecil's fate and the fate of delisted grizzly bears:

- Like Cecil, "hunters" will pay substantial sums to outfitters to kill grizzly bears for fun and profit, respectively;
- Like Cecil, the great bears will be lured by outfitters and hunters in the same manner that today in Wyoming, for example, black bears are lured by oil drums containing rotted meat and mountain lions are lured by packs of dogs with electronic collars and shot out of trees where they seek refuge;
- Like Cecil, the bears will be ambushed and assassinated, frequently after periods of suffering from fatal wounds (witness the many elk left to die horrible deaths after being wounded by irresponsible hunters during the annual "elk reduction programs" sponsored by your National Park Service in Grand Teton National Park);
- Like Cecil, the bears' heads will be removed for wall decorations with ferocious expressions or their entire hides will be removed for floor or furniture coverings or other decorations (see attached photos, including Governor Palin in her Anchorage office);
- Like Cecil, whatever remains of carcasses will be left to rot (see attached photos of elk parts left by hunters to rot in Grand Teton National Park during a recent elk reduction program).

So what is the difference between Cecil's fate and the fate of grizzly bears if FWS prevails?

- Answer: The renewed slaughter of grizzly bears will be legal with the blessing of FWS and the state wildlife agencies; the assassination of Cecil might have been illegal if the luring was unlawful and/or bribes were paid; and the slaughter of the great bears will be kept under the radar to avoid the problems for FWS and the wildlife agencies generated by Cecil's assassination.
- Better answer: There is **no difference** in principle. Grizzly bears, exterminated nearly to the point of extinction and now only beginning the process of recovery, will again be subjected to slaughter, in the most cruel and inhumane manner, for pure fun and profit.

Free these great bears. Stop this madness now. Move on to protection and preservation of other deserving.

Sincerely,

Robert H. Aland
Winnetka, IL

--

Michael J. Bean

Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks

Room 7256, Department of the Interior

Washington, DC 20240

202-208-4416

202-208-4684 (fax)

michael_bean@ios.doi.gov