

## Conversation Contents

Crockford --- again!

Mike Lockhart <(b) (6) gmail.com>

**From:** Mike Lockhart <(b) (6) gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sat Jun 07 2014 19:20:30 GMT-0600 (MDT)  
**To:** Steven Amstrup <samstrup@pbears.org>, Geoff York <GYork@wwfcanada.org>, George M Durner <gdurner@usgs.gov>, Anthony M Pagano <apagano@usgs.gov>, Kristin Simac <ksimac@usgs.gov>, Krista Wright <kwright@pbears.org>  
**Subject:** Crockford --- again!

you may already know about this.

<http://dailycaller.com/2014/05/30/scientists-admit-polar-bear-numbers-were-made-up-to-satisfy-public-demand/>

Steven Amstrup <samstrup@pbears.org>

**From:** Steven Amstrup <samstrup@pbears.org>  
**Sent:** Sun Jun 08 2014 10:35:15 GMT-0600 (MDT)  
**To:** Mike Lockhart <(b) (6) gmail.com>  
**Subject:** Re: Crockford --- again!

Yeah Mike, this is the result of Dag Vongraven (PBSG Chair) trying to be proactive and send Crockford an explanation of what we know and don't know about polar bear population sizes. As you know, Crockford is constantly making comments about there being more bears now than ever-so why are we concerned etc. Dag was trying to straighten that out but not realizing that Crockford is not in any way reasonable and will twist anything she has to her messaging advantage.

There is of course nothing new in pointing out that for many of our polar bear populations we have only educated guesses of their numbers. This is abundantly covered in the notes and proceedings of the PBSG and has been since the earliest days. I have written at least one piece for the PBI web site on these numbers and their uncertainty, presumably it is there some where. And, I have explained this concept to many media people over the years. So this information has been out there a long time. Somehow, with her shrill voice, Crockford is able to make news out of something that is not surrounded by any controversy (we all know we don't have good estimates for many populations), and is not "new."

One thing Dag did say in his email to her that is somewhat problematic. He suggested that part of the reason PBSG provides these rough estimates is to meet public pressure. That is an unfortunate statement, as public interest or pressure never has been even a consideration in producing numbers. I am not sure Dag even knows why he added that, and he knows that public demand has had nothing to do with provision of those estimates. Even way back in the early days of PBSG, we provided rough estimates of how many polar bears may be in the world. And in those early days, no one in the public ever hears of the PGSG. We worked in near total anonymity with no public contact.

So, that statement about the public is unfortunate, but I don't think it will haunt us for long. There is only so much hay to be made from restating something we all have been up front about for decades.

The good news, if there is any about this, is that at least momentarily, it has taken Crockford's sights off of me. For the past several months, it seems, I have been one of her favorite targets.

SCA

On Jun 7, 2014, at 6:20 PM, Mike Lockhart <(b) (6) gmail.com> wrote: