

the international primate protection league



NEWSLETTER

SEPTEMBER 1976 VOL 3 NO 2

TWENTY-EIGHT PRIMATE SPECIES PROPOSED FOR U.S. ENDANGERED LIST

Twenty-seven primate species are currently under consideration for the U.S. Endangered Species List, joining 35 species and sub-species already listed.

The U.S. Endangered Species List came into being following the passage of the U.S. Endangered Species Act of 1969. This Act established that species of wildlife determined to be facing extinction and placed on the U.S. Endangered List could be imported by permit only. The Department of the Interior was charged with preparation of the list. The first list of endangered foreign species was announced on 2 December 1970, a year after the passage of the Act. The following primate species were placed on the Endangered List: avahi *Avahi* spp.: aye-aye *Daubentonia madagascarensis*: red colobus *Colobus badius* *Colobus rufomitratus*: Zanzibar red colobus *Colobus badius kirkii*: Kloss gibbon *Hylobates klossi*: pileated gibbon *Hylobates pileatus*: gorilla *Gorilla gorilla*: indris *Indri* spp.: douc langur *Pygathrix nemaeus*: Pagi Island langur *Simias concolor*: lemurs *Lemur* spp. gentle lemur *Hapalemur* spp.: sportive and weasel lemurs *Lepilemur* spp.: dwarf lemurs *Cheirogaleus* spp.: mouse lemurs *Microcebus* spp.: fork-marked lemurs *Phaner furcifer*: lion tailed macaque *Macaca silenus*: Tana River mangabey *Cercocebus galertus galertus*: Goeldi's Marmoset (*Callimico goeldii*: spider monkey *Ateles geoffroyi frontatus*: spider monkey *Ateles geoffroyi panamensis*: red-backed squirrel monkey *Saimiri oerstedii*: woolly spider monkey *Brachyteles arachnoides*: orang-utan *Pongo pygmaeus*: white-nosed saki *Chiropotes albinus*: sifakas *Propithecus* spp.: golden marmosets *Leontideus* spp.: and uakari *Cacajou* spp.

Between the passage of the Act and the preparation of the list, there was continued trading in several of the species thought likely to be listed. For example, F. J. Zeehandelaar, a wildlife dealer in La Rochelle, New York, imported a Douc langur and a Proboscis monkey on 6 May 1970 and 3 Douc langurs and 2 Proboscis monkeys on 20 May 1970. (The Proboscis monkey was finally not listed till July 1976). Both these shipments originated from Winston Wulff, a dealer in Copenhagen, Denmark.

The Endangered Species Act of 1969 was replaced in 1973 by a new Act. The Endangered Species Act of 1973 was far more detailed and specific than the 1969 Act, specifying procedures for the listing of new species as endangered and adding a new category of "Threatened", tightening up permit procedures, and increasing penalties for violations. The Act also provided for funds to be made available to foreign governments for wildlife conservation programs and required co-operation in the conservation of endangered species from all other agencies of government. The 1973 Act further made it illegal to trade in any species contrary to the provisions of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species, which the United States had ratified in August 1973.

Unfortunately, the passage of the 1973 Act did nothing to protect many rare but unlisted species of primates. The Department of the Interior had not added a single primate to the Endangered List since the original listings in 1970, and took no steps to protect Convention species as required by the Act of 1973. As a result of this unsatisfactory situation, the Fund for Animals in May 1975 initiated legal action to require the Department of the Interior to add to the U.S. Endangered List all species listed on Appendix I of the Convention but not on the U.S. List. (The most critically endangered animals are listed on Appendix I of the Convention). The Fund's attorneys charged that the Department of the Interior had virtually ignored the Endangered

Species Act in the year and a half since its passage. Lewis Regenstein, Vice-President of the Fund for Animals, stated, "We cannot sit back and let hundreds of rare species go down the drain while indifferent bureaucrats look the other way. We are determined to try and save for future generations what is left of our rapidly-dwindling wildlife heritage. If we cannot do that, we can at least point out those responsible for allowing the extinction of these species to occur". In a 21 March 1976 letter addressed to the Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Senator Alan Cranston expressed his "serious and urgent" concern that Interior was not "pursuing the legislative intent of the Act and its Mandates."

The reasons for the Department of the Interior's failure to implement the 1973 Act are unclear, but Regenstein attributed the delays to "political pressures, economic considerations and bureaucratic red tape." (News release, 27 May 1975). The threat of legal action stimulated the Department of the Interior into long overdue action. On 26 September 1975, 216 species from Appendix I of the Convention were proposed for the U.S. Endangered List. After nine further months, the addition of the following primate species was announced: howler monkey *Alouatta palliata*: golden langur *Presthytis geei*: langur *Presthytis pileatus*: langur *Presthytis entellus*: proboscis monkey *Nasalis larvatus*: gibbons *Hylobates* spp. and siamang *Symphalangus syndactylus*.

On 13 April 1976, 27 further primate species were proposed for the Endangered List. The species were selected on the basis of a report on the status of primate populations compiled by Mrs. Jacklyn Wollheim under contract to the Department of the Interior. Twelve species were proposed for addition to the Endangered List, and 15 for the Threatened List. Those proposed as endangered were: cottontop marmoset *Saguinus oedipus*: pied tamarin *Saguinus bicolor*: Diana monkey *Cercopithecus diana*: red-eared nose-spotted monkey *Cercopithecus erythrotis*: red-bellied monkey *Cercopithecus erythrogastis*: L'Hoest's monkey *Cercopithecus l'hoesti*: white-collared mangabey *Cercocebus torquatus*: black colobus *Colobus satanas*: mandrill *Papio sphinx*: drill *Papio leucophaeus*: Francois' leaf monkey *Presbytis francoisi*, and the yellow-tailed woolly monkey *Lagothrix flavicauda*, a species thought to be extinct but recently rediscovered.

The following primates were proposed for the "Threatened" category: lesser slow loris *Nycticebus pygmaeus*: Philippine tarsier *Tarsier syrichta*: white-footed tamarin *Saguinus leucopus*: black howler monkey *Alouatta nigra*: squirrel monkey (*Saimiri sciureus*: stump-tail macaque *Macaca arcoides*: gelada baboon *Theropithecus gelada*: Formosan rock macaque *Macaca cyclopis*: Japanese macaque *Macaca fuscata*: toque macaque *Macaca sinica*: long-tailed langur *Presthytis potenziani*: purple-faced langur *Presthytis senex*: Tonkin snub-nosed monkey *Rhinopithecus avunculus*: pygmy chimpanzee *Pan paniscus*, and Chimpanzee *Pan troglodytes*.

Comments were sought from the public on the proposals. Altogether, 275 letters were received, 255 in favour of all or parts of the proposal, and 20 opposed. All letters become part of the public record and sample comments follow.

Dr. Jane Goodall, Director of the Gombe Stream Research Center in Tanzania, supported the addition of the chimpanzee, stating:

In Tanzania, the chimpanzee has complete government protection and no hunting or capture is allowed. This was also the case in Uganda - I do not know what the situation is today in that country. My understanding of the situation in West and Central African countries is that, whilst numbers of chimpanzees are still found in various places

Sept
1976



Some of the species proposed
for addition to the U.S.
Endangered List.

Squirrel Monkey
Stumptail Macaque
Tarsier
Japanese Macaque

photos by courtesy of
Florida Monkey Sanctuary.

Sept
Dec 1976

throughout the equatorial forest belt, there are also a number of areas where chimpanzees, that were common in the early part of this century, have been virtually exterminated.

The main dangers which face the chimpanzee today are (1) hunting for food by local people, (b) hunting for capture and export — mainly for scientific (mostly medical) purposes; and (c) destruction of their habitat. The first-hand understanding I have gained from my 16 years of work with free-living chimpanzee has clearly shown how quickly a normal wild population could become seriously endangered. The following points should be taken into consideration when reviewing the need for giving the chimpanzee the maximum possible protection.

1. The chimpanzees being studied in the Gombe National Park (since 1960) receive complete and effective protection from any form of hunting: it seems nevertheless that the communities known to us have maintained a stable population level and have not increased their numbers.
2. The chimpanzee is a *slow reproducer*: a female has her first infant around 13 or 14 years. There is a 5 to 6 year spacing between live births and a minimum of 14 months before the female who has lost an infant will reproduce again. And the adult male:female sex ratio is only tipped slightly in favour of the female.
3. The child has a long period of dependency. During our years of work at Gombe we have seen the effect on a number of young chimpanzees of the loss of their mothers. Infants of three years and under have not survived. Four youngsters lost their mothers when they were between 4 and 5 years old: two survived and two died. One young male of 8 years old, unusually dependent, was unable to survive the death of his very old mother, and died 3 weeks later. Given the fact that hunting methods are often primitive, it is likely that many chimpanzee mothers who are shot in order to capture their infants will not die immediately, but will manage to escape, only to die later. Their small child is not likely to survive. Other infants may be killed as their mothers fall to the ground, or die as the result of the shock of capture. Thus for every youngster which reaches its ultimate destination alive, several other individuals (adult and young) will almost certainly have lost their lives.
4. As humans move further and further into areas previously occupied by wild animals the chimpanzees increasingly run the risk of contracting human infectious diseases (they are immune to none save, perhaps, cholera). At Gombe the chimpanzees were exposed to a human epidemic of what was almost certainly polio. Six chimpanzees died in our study community alone and 6 others were crippled. Crippled chimps have been seen in other areas of the Park and, presumably, others died also. Outbreaks of some human diseases, such as measles, could wipe out large numbers of chimpanzees who have no immunity (in the Antwerp Zoo all the chimpanzees but one died during a measles epidemic).

Habitat destruction probably forces chimpanzees to move further and further away into wilder country, since, unlike baboons and some other species, they cannot normally tolerate any profound change of their environment. Such movements will often produce crowding, and this may well have disastrous effects on social behavior. An apparent outbreak of exceptionally violent behavior has recently occurred at Gombe when adults (4) of a neighboring community were killed by gangs of males, and a number of infants were also killed. This coincided with the apparent "invasion" of a very large community from the south. It seems that this community may have moved its range because of human agriculture outside the park boundaries, thus producing a crowded condition.

For the above reasons, it appears that the chimpanzee is not well adapted for survival under the persecution of hunting or changing environmental conditions. I strongly feel, as I have felt for many years, that any possible steps which can be taken to offer our closest relative as much protection as possible in the wild should be taken NOW. When chimpanzee populations have been reduced to the extent that he is considered "endangered", it may well be too late to introduce protective measures.

The *Ghana Wildlife Society* supported the addition of the chimpanzee and the Diana monkey to the Endangered List. Writing on behalf of the Society, Mrs. Valerie Sackey stated:

The *Ghana Wildlife Society* strongly supports the move to include the Diana monkey in the Endangered category of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife authorities. Already severely limited in numbers by habitat destruction, the Diana urgently needs relief from hunting and capturing if it is to survive in Ghana.

Regarding the Chimpanzee, whilst this Society welcomes its inclusion in the Threatened category, we would strongly urge that this animal be declared Endangered. Isolated populations of chimpanzees in Ghana are probably already not viable. The major threat to their survival is the killing of adults to obtain young for illegal exports. Any move to stop this trade would be most welcome.

Anna Merz, IPPL's representative in Ghana, also supported the addition of the chimpanzee and the Diana monkey.

The chimpanzee is now confined to a relatively small area in the south and west of Ghana and is effectively protected only within the borders of the Bia National Park, an area of 118 square miles. The Diana monkey is a little more widespread but has become increasingly rare within the past 5 years.

Young chimpanzees are taken for export both for the pet trade and for research laboratories. Most of these young animals are smuggled out over the Ivory Coast border and thence to Liberia from where they may be legally exported. Due to the high prices offered abroad the smuggling of these baby chimps, despite high mortality, is still highly profitable to the dealers. In Liberia in 1975, \$100 (U.S.) could be obtained for a baby chimp in the bush. In the first 8 months of 1974, 42 chimps were legally exported from Liberia of which 36 went to the U.S.A. I wonder how many of these young animals originated in Ghana and how many died before they ever reached Liberia?

In a country like Ghana the enforcement of law outside the main population centers is extremely difficult due both to the lack of transport and the lack of trained personnel. We cannot protect our endangered species without the fullest co-operation of all the developed countries. As long as a market, and a highly profitable one, exists for these primates abroad, they will continue to be smuggled out. In Ghana, the chimpanzee, and to a lesser extent, the Diana monkey, are both faced with extinction unless both drastic steps are taken here and maximum support is given to their enforcement abroad.

Ms. Sonia Jeffrey, IPPL representative for Liberia, wrote in support of the chimpanzee:

Export of chimpanzees to the U.S. from some West African countries (especially Liberia) is a lucrative business with little regard for the depleting small wild populations. It is estimated that 3 to 4 chimpanzees die for each one that reaches a U.S. agent successfully. Death is due to the shooting of the mother, injury to other members of the group, pneumonia, malnutrition, etc. in captive young, accidental shooting of young alone with the mother. As yet the only successful way of capturing young chimpanzees is at the expense of the mother. Experiments using anaesthetic darts currently in progress in Liberia (New York Blood Center) have not been very successful and would not deter the local hunter from using his traditional shot-gun.

There is little active restriction of chimpanzee export in several West African countries and legal requirements are not often met. According to Government of Liberia files, U.S. agents import 95% of chimpanzees exported from Liberia, and wild chimpanzees in this country, as in all West Africa, are seriously declining. More restrictive legislation concerning import of wild-caught animals into the U.S. will help to discourage the cruel and wasteful trade in chimpanzees witnessed in West Africa.

Dr. Vernon Reynolds, Chairman of the Working Party on Conservation of the Primate Society of Great Britain, applauded the proposed measures to protect additional primate species:

We have discussed these proposals at meetings of the Working Party on Conservation, at Council meetings of the Primate Society of Great Britain, and at the Annual General Meeting of the Primate Society of Great Britain. On each occasion, there has been approval of the steps you are taking to give additional protection to a number of primate species. In particular, the Society notes with approval the proposal to add both the chimpanzee and Pygmy chimpanzee to the Endangered List. The Society has brought this matter to the attention of British authorities and as a result, our own trade conventions and import regulations acknowledge that these species of chimpanzees are endangered, and they are on our list of endangered species.

Dr. Tony Pfeiffer, Director of the Great Ape Protection Project (GAPP), which works for the rehabilitation of laboratory chimpanzees when their research careers are over, emphasised the advantages of replacing wild-caught chimpanzees or by colony-bred animals.

There are upwards of 300 chimpanzees (probably more like 400) being held in American laboratories. These animals are maintained at a yearly cost to us of roughly \$360,000 (based on a cost estimate of

Sept
1976
Dec 1977

about \$1200 a month to keep 10 chimps in a lab... a conservative estimate). A very small proportion of this cost is currently shared by biomedical investigators, rather it is assumed directly by labs and/or the government because there is precious little money for research these days. From a purely practical/utilitarian point of view, they're costing us an arm and a leg to support, and, at year's end, we have nothing to show for it. Most or many of the laboratory chimps are not in breeding programs so they're not even producing infants.

On islands, without the expense of strong cages and other laboratory expenses and problems, these animals can be recycled into compatible breeding groups. At roughly half the current cost, or about \$180,000, we can keep the ones we've got and produce 30-50 infants per annum. The infants will help defray even this cost partially (40 infants at \$1500 apiece yields \$60,000)....

In some ways, then, it is my belief that we can have our cake and eat it too... save money, produce infants, and not contribute to the decimation of wild populations.

The entire Editorial Board of the journal *Nihonzara* (Japanese macaque) supported the addition of the species to the U.S. Endangered List. Writing on their behalf, Dr. Akira Suzuki noted:

These members who signed this letter are a group which is following up the distribution of the Japanese macaque from the viewpoint of conservation of the species. We are very appreciative to hear that the Japanese macaque has been proposed for the U.S. Endangered List as threatened. We support this proposal which treats the Japanese macaque as a threatened species.

The statement was signed by Drs. A. Suzuki, K. Masui, S. Nakama, A. Ashizawa, N. Maruyama, S. Tanaka, K. Tokita, F. Fukuda, K. Takasugi, M. Koganezawa, S. Uehara, and S. Yoshihiro.

Charles Shuttleworth, who represents IPPL in Taiwan, wrote:

I sincerely hope that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's recent proposal to place the Formosan Rock macaque on the Endangered Species List will be accepted and become part of legislation.

The greatest source of danger to the survival of this macaque here is the U.S. Navy's Medical Research Center known as NAMRU which experiments with 450 macaques at a time. These animals are trapped for them in the South of Taiwan and often supplied with limbs missing due to the method of trapping. It is reasonable to assume therefore that many of them die. Efforts at breeding by artificial insemination have been attempted by this unit. However, what success has been achieved to date suggests this will not provide an alternative to trapping from the wild. Macaques are also killed for medicine and for food known as "Monkey Cakes".

The International Primate Protection League supported the addition of all 28 primate species. As well as discussing problems in the habitat countries and illegal trade in some of the species, IPPL presented data extracted from the report *Non-human primates: usage and availability for biomedical programs* (National Academy of Sciences, 1975), showing the pattern of exploitation of those of the proposed primates most heavily used in biomedical activities.

1. *Chimpanzee*. The figures indicate a high mortality for chimpanzees maintained in captivity in laboratories. In 1973, the only year for which such statistics are available, 77 chimpanzees were imported into the United States for research purposes. Of that total, 27 animals (35%) were dead by the end of the year. Those laboratories co-operating with the primate inventory conducted by the Institute of Laboratory Animal Resources in 1973 reported a total of 673 chimpanzees, of which only 150 had been maintained for three years or more.
2. *Stumptail macaque*. Stumptail macaques have been used in research of a destructive nature. In 1973, 451 stumptail macaques were imported into the United States for research; 329 of these animals (73%) were dead within the same year. On 1 October 1973, the total laboratory inventory reported for this species was 1083, of which only 287 animals (26%) had been maintained 3 years or more. Sufficient efforts have not been made to breed this species in captivity. In 1973, only 68 colony births were reported.
3. *Cottontop marmoset*. On 1 October 1973 the total laboratory inventory reported for this species was 614 of which only 123 animals had been maintained for 3 years or more (20%). In 1973, a total of 78 cottontop marmosets were in breeding colonies, with a total of 30 births.
4. *Squirrel monkey*. Squirrel monkeys have been used in research of a destructive nature. On 1 October 1973 the total laboratory inventory reported for this species was 4358, of which only 670

animals (15%) had been maintained for 3 years or more. In 1973, 2323 squirrel monkeys were imported for research; 1350 of these animals (58%) were dead within the same year. In 1973, only 499 squirrel monkeys were in breeding colonies, with 185 births reported.

Dr. Theodore Cooper, Assistant Secretary for Health in the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, had two criticisms of the proposal.

The factor most responsible for endangering various primate species has been destruction of habitat in the countries of origin. The import and use of these animals for biomedical purposes has undoubtedly been minimal and relatively unimportant in threatening the survival of any species.

We believe the proposed rules should be changed in the following ways:

- (1) Squirrel monkeys should not be included in the list of threatened species.
- (2) The commercial trade of endangered and threatened species within the United States should not be limited.

Jack and Viola Kiracofe of Boiling Springs Zoo Park opposed the entire proposal, asserting:

We oppose the addition of 12 species of primates to the Endangered Species List. We also oppose the addition of 15 species of primates to the Threatened List. The primary cause which threatens these 27 species is the destruction of their natural habitat; the U.S. Department of the Interior has no means to control this destruction. The principal, real chance these species have for survival is a captive breeding program in the U.S.

Dr. Kent Perryman, a research psychologist at the University of California at Los Angeles, feared his research involving squirrel monkeys might end should the species be added to the Endangered List. He wrote:

I wish to make a plea that this (listing) not be done since I have been using squirrel monkeys in sensory neurophysiological investigations for the last six years. At present, I am using 12 adult males in a behavioral-neurophysiological study with the purpose of relating the role of eye movements in visual attention to extracellular neural activity in the thalamic pulvinar nuclei. The squirrel monkey is essential to my work as a biological model because of its size, cost, and ease of maintenance as well as meeting the basic requirements of possessing a central nervous system similar to that of man.

If the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service places this primate on the "Threatened" species list, my research, which has important implications for man's health, welfare and performance efficiency, will be endangered. Due to very severe cutbacks in grant funds from the National Institutes of Health, I would not be able to substitute a more expensive primate for the squirrel monkey.

David Phelan, D. V. M., the Manager of Laboratory Animal Science at Smith Kline and French Laboratories, took exception to the proposed addition of the squirrel monkey.

It is our strong desire to conserve all wildlife species. The squirrel monkey is, however, understood to exist in quantities sufficient to meet ongoing research needs without posing a threat to their existence. We urge that no regulations be adopted that would deny U.S. researchers this every necessary research animal.

Dr. David Tedeschi also opposed the addition of the squirrel monkey:

The squirrel monkey has been a mainstay of psychopharmacological research for the past 20 years... The squirrel monkey has permitted us to identify many useful drugs and to screen out many toxic drugs before ever reaching man. I would respectfully urge the Wildlife Service to reconsider any action which would reduce the availability of the squirrel monkey for research purposes.

Berne M. Levine, D. V. M., President of Pet Farm, which is described on the company stationery as "The Nation's largest quality Importers and Exporters of Animals" opposed the listings in general and some of the species in particular:

The squirrel monkey... probably has less chance of becoming extinct in the near future than man himself. I personally have flown over massive jungle for hours and can assure you that our human destruction of their environment in these areas will not occur for decades... more than 2000 a month are eaten or destroyed as pests

Sept
1976

in Iquitos, Peru alone. Cottontop marmosets, which are commonly sold in the market places of Colombia and Panama as pets should certainly not be considered as endangered species As for chimpanzees, only importation will preserve this great species.

Surely the people responsible for writing these laws cannot truly believe they are doing anything to preserve the species mentioned. Obviously they are uninformed, either deliberately or through ignorance. It concerns me that a company such as mine has not even been questioned as to our thoughts on specie (sic) we have imported throughout the years.

More opposition to the squirrel monkey came from *Brigadier General Kenneth Dirks* of the Office of the Surgeon General of the U.S. Army; he argued:

The threatened status of these animals has been categorically denied by the Institute of Laboratory Animal Resources of the National Academy of Sciences, the Interagency Primate Steering Committee, and the Primate Conservation Committee of the International Primatological Society. As recently stated by Dr. Richard Thorington, Jr. of the Smithsonian Institution and a member of the International Primatological Society, "The primate species *Saimiri sciureus* (squirrel monkey) is no more endangered than *Homo Sapiens*."

An example of the crucial biomedical need for this monkey species is the A/swine influenza program The U.S. Army Medical and Research Development Command has been asked to participate by evaluating (a) the squirrel monkey as an experimental host of New Jersey (swine) influenza; a candidate vaccine against this virus on the basis of protection observed in immunised squirrel monkeys after virulent virus challenge; and, the prophylactic and therapeutic efficacy of two anti-viral drugs.

Dr. Edward Mirand, Associate Director of the Roswell Park Memorial Institute, commented:

Among those primate species purported by you to be endangered are Squirrel monkeys and Stumptail macaques. I wish to point out that these two species, among others, are utilized at Roswell Park Memorial Institute in our cancer research endeavours If these two species were to be included on the Endangered, Threatened Species List, we would be unable to obtain these species, and projects vital to the acquisition of vitally-needed medical knowledge would have to be terminated.

Dr. Larry Byrd, Chairman of the Division of Primate Behavior at the Yerkes Primate Center, expressed concern at what he considered over-protection of wildlife:

Much of the blame for the decrease in animal populations can be attributed directly to humanity and the tradition of utilising resources presently available with little concern for the status of these resources in the future. My concern is that although the pendulum may have swung to an extreme in one direction where animal species were wasted and used indiscriminately, we should be concerned not to over-react and cause the pendulum to swing to the opposite extreme in our efforts to initiate policies for the protection of wildlife.

Mr. Michael Nolan, President of the Primate Imports Corporation, which in recent years has imported around 28,000 primates a year for biomedical customers, was outraged at the proposal:

These proposed rule-makings are of such profound impact on our operations in serving the research community that it is virtually impossible in the course of a letter to adequately counter some of the language and provide the multitudinous detail to refute it. I, therefore, earnestly request that a public hearing be held on these matters

A letter bearing no address and with an illegible signature also opposed the proposed listings:

How can I continue to have faith in my country when I am subjected to such unsubstantiated dribble as the "Proposal to list 27 species of primates as Endangered or Threatened Species?" Why are you incapable of understanding that wild animals, generally, have a better chance of surviving in captivity than facing their daily predators (sic) in the wild? Why, in your four pages of dribble, have you not considered the breedability of these 27 species? Isn't it possible that the day will come when only chimps and stumptails etc. producing are those in captivity? Doesn't curtailing the trafficking of these primates minimise the number available for breeding purposes?

Since the trapper and the importers are the most knowledgeable in these areas, why are you not referring to them? Instead, you prefer to use (a) it may indicate, (b) it has been reported, (c) is probably extinct,

(d) is generally concluded. Why not get someone, or department, or people who know what they're talking about to write this regulation?

The American Association of Zoological Parks and Aquariums emphasised the organisation's dedication to conservation as its primary goal, but opposed the proposed additions to the Endangered List:

The AAZPA supports the need for additional protection to be accorded these 27 species of primates. However, we feel that the restrictions on importation contained in this proposed rule-making constitutes a very weak step. We urgently request Interior to become aware of the potentials for captive propagation in our zoological institutions and to promulgate regulations that will facilitate captive breeding rather than hinder it We can not comprehend how these proposed regulations will, in any way, enhance the survival of any of these listed species.

Julian Bronson, Manager of Bronson Tropical Birds, New York, opposed all the proposed listings, especially the chimpanzee. Bronson is a regular advertiser in the *Simian*, the monthly magazine of the Simian Society, an organisation of owners of pet monkeys. His advertisement in the May 1974 *Simian* announced:

Baby chimpanzees, hand-raised, intelligent and human. We are the largest U.S. chimp importers. Cinnamon and Black Capuchins-Spiders-Squirrels-Owl-Woollys acclimatised and wormed. Cute Spot-nose Mono Guenons-Stumptails (miniature chimps) - Gibbons. All simians young, acclimatised.

Bronson's statement of opposition to the proposal to list the 27 species was written on stationery carrying the message:

A BRID TO BRIGHTEN EVERY HOME - A MONKEY FOR COMPANIONSHIP

Baby Chimpanzees a speciality - Parrots-Macaws-Mynahs
Colourful Finches - Singing Softbills-Canaries,
all types - Exotic Pets Animals - All species baby monkeys

Bronson complained:

The Directors of the F. and W. (Fish and Wildlife Service) are constantly coming up every year with lists of new wildlife to put on the Endangered List. This cannot be occurring at that rate

Since last March, they have been talking about putting Chimpanzees on the Endangered List, which is simply not true. I have written to the U.S. consulates of 14 countries in which Chimps are endemic, and the first two enclosed state that they exist in very abundant numbers in the wild. We are awaiting replies from other consulates to complete our Survey. With this official proof, there is no justification for the F. and W. to say they are threatened.

Trained chimpanzees are vital to the only livelihood of most Animal Acts, with Circuses, Fairs, exhibits and Television programs dependent upon these Acts.

The F. and W. Service is getting completely out of hand, and we in this business live under a constant threat that Wildlife will all be removed for exhibits, pets and entertainment. We would much appreciate your (seeing that) Chimps are not put on a threatened listing.

Bronson enclosed 2 letters from U.S. Embassy Economic/Commercial Officers. Mr. Daniel Waterman of the U.S. Embassy in Dar-es-Salaam, Tanzania, stated "it is generally accepted that Chimpanzees are in abundance in Tanzania", and referred Mr. Bronson to 3 authorities which "might be able to guide you . . . on the possibility of importing wild animals from Tanzania." Mr. Kevin Brennan of the U.S. Embassy in Libreville, Gabon, reported that chimpanzees "might be numerous as a great deal of the forestland is not exploited." Mr. Brennan referred Mr. Bronson to an animal dealership ironically called "Paradis des Animaux" (Animal Paradise), which, he stated, "deals in animals and sells chimpanzees."

Several of the letter-writers seem unaware that the Endangered Species Act of 1973 does not prohibit trade in listed species but merely regulates it. It is unlikely, for example, that the Roswell Park Memorial would be denied a permit for any legally available primates. The objection that the United States can do nothing about habitat destruction ignores section 8 of the Act which provides for funding of overseas conservation programs, assignment of personnel to help with such programs either in the United States or elsewhere.

One problem inherent in the current procedure for adding species to the U.S. Endangered List is that of stockpiling in anticipation of the listing of species. IPPL has learned that 37 infant chimpanzees were

Dec 1974
Sent

imported to the U.S. from Sierra Leone in June 1976. Of these, 20 were imported by Primate Imports, a supplier of laboratory primates, and 20 by the International Animal Exchange. When a species is proposed for addition to the U.S. Endangered List, it can be presumed to be in danger of extinction and such last-minute trading can only aggravate the situation, especially when the species in question is capture, like the chimpanzee, by the killing of the mother to capture her infant. IPPL has therefore contacted the Department of the Interior suggesting that an embargo be placed on the trading of species in the months between the announcement in the *Federal Register* of their proposed addition to the Endangered List and the final decision.

Another complication is that the more support a species receives, the more excuse there is for bureaucratic delays. Although the Sea Otter is not a primate, its case is relevant. This species was proposed along with the other 216 Appendix I Convention species. Close to 300 letters in favor of its addition to the list were received. There were only 2 letters of opposition. Ironically, this species, which received far more support than any other proposed species, was not included on the final listing; the stated reason was that, due to the large volume of correspondence, more time was required to consider its case. Presumably the 9 months which had already elapsed since the proposal were not considered sufficient.

There have been and continue to be many problems in enforcing the U.S. Endangered Species legislation. One which is becoming more important is that as yet it can do nothing to stop U.S. research institutions from exploiting endangered species in their habitat countries or third countries where such legislation does not exist.

Another problem is the identification of species. Few Customs and wildlife officers can recognise the hundreds of listed species, many of which they will never see in a lifetime. An unusual example occurred in 1973. A shipment of siamangs arrived from Singapore for a safari park near Los Angeles. It was passed by the authorities. Later, when one of the infant siamangs did not appear to be growing, expert identification was sought and the animal identified as a highly endangered Kloss' gibbon (the rare all-black gibbon from the Mentawi Islands off Sumatra, Indonesia). The story came to light when the safari park applied for and was granted Endangered Species permit No. 443 to re-export the gibbon to Basel Zoo.

Penalties for violating the Endangered Species Act are relatively light; for a "knowing" violation, a civil penalty of up to \$10,000, and, for a "wilful" violation, a criminal penalty of a fine of up to \$20,000 and/or a year in prison. The difference between "knowing" and "wilful" is not specified. Other offenses, presumably "unknowing" are only subject to \$100 penalties.

However, in spite of the law's weaknesses, it has curtailed the flow of endangered species into the U.S.A. The outcome of the current proposal will be announced in a later IPPL *Newsletter*, as will future proposals to add still more primate species to the list.

MORE SNAKE-BOX SMUGGLING

The November 1974 issue of the IPPL *Newsletter* reported the events surrounding the shipment to the United States from Thailand of 16 Slow Lorises in sacks labelled "Spitting Cobras". The Slow Loris is a small nocturnal primate found in Southeast Asia. These primates were shipped in January 1974 by the Bangkok Wildlife Company and consigned to John Stidworthy, P.O. Box 268, San Carlos, California. The phone contact on the invoice accompanying the shipment was 408-374-3411. The number turned out to belong to a company called "Reptiles of the World" in Menlo Park, California. The mislabelled shipment was detected by the California Department of Fish and Game. The shipment was in clear violation of the U.S. Lacey Act provisions against mislabelling of shipments, and probably also in violation of State of California primate quarantine requirements. "Reptiles of the World" claimed that it had not ordered the seized shipment, although someone at the above phone number had earlier accepted the "Cash on Delivery" charges for the consignment. An investigation revealed that there was no such person as John Stidworthy. No action was taken by any agency against either the importer or the carrier of the shipment, Pan American Airways.

A new light is cast on the events described above by the discovery of documents which show that P.O. Box 268, San Carlos was probably used to facilitate illegal traffic in wildlife FOR AT LEAST FOUR YEARS. In Washington, D.C. in March 1976, Dr. Shirley McGreal, Co-Chairwoman of IPPL, unearthed some old import declarations for the years 1969 and 1970. Attached to one declaration was an invoice



on the stationery of the Bangkok Wildlife Company dated 11 August 1970 which reads:

Sold to: Herpetological Research Exchange, San Carlos, California 94070

2 small King Cobras	\$ 40.00
2 mangrove snakes	\$ 4.00
3 Naglers Pit Vipers	\$ 42.00
1 Brown Pit Viper (rare)	\$ 6.00
2 Hylobates lar in snake's crate	\$110.00

Packed in 1 crate. Ship under COD. Certified true and correct,
Kampeng Ploentham, Director,
Bangkok Wildlife Company.

The expression "in snake's crate" (sic) was underlined in the original. *Hylobates lar* is the scientific name of the White-handed gibbon, one species of the small Southeast Asia ape. The gibbon is a protected animal of the first category in Thailand and its commercial exploitation and shipment has been banned since 1965. Gibbons are known to be terrified of snakes, and one can only imagine the ordeal undergone by these two gibbons packed in a crate with snakes, which were presumably placed in bags inside the crate, the usual method used to ship snakes. The accompanying import declaration gave the address of the Herpetological Research Exchange as P.O. Box 268, San Carlos, California, and listed the gibbons along with the snakes.

Dr. McGreal requested copies of these documents from the Department of the Interior. In a letter dated 23 April 1976, the Department refused to provide copies on the grounds that production of the records would:

1. interfere with enforcement proceedings
2. deprive a person of his right to a fair trial
3. constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

Henry Heymann, IPPL's Washington representative, appealed Interior's decision on the following grounds:

1. Since the 5-year statute of limitations had expired, there would be no trial
2. Perpetrators of the "heinous act of shipping gibbons in snake crates" have no claim to privacy.

Eventually the papers were released. IPPL has sent copies to the Wild-Life Conservation and Customs departments in Thailand. Currently, the Bangkok Wildlife Company is under investigation for the

Sept
Dec 1976

1974 loris smuggling, and these documents show that the company is a habitual offender.

In a similar incident, the Bangkok Wildlife Company shipped 4 gibbons in snake-crates to the U.S. in June 1971. These gibbons were discovered during a transit stop at the RSPCA Hostel, Heathrow Airport, London. Three of the gibbons were dead. The gibbons had been shipped in pairs, stuffed into crates 36 in. x 18 in. x 5 in., in which they would neither sit nor stand. The autopsy report identified the cause of death as "cardiac failure with extensive damage to the lungs and thorax . . . condition of the animals was due to the way they were sent."

It is IPPL's contention that seizure of the 1970 shipment of gibbons consigned to the Herpetological Research Exchange and prompt notification of the Thai authorities might have prevented a whole series of shipments by the Bangkok Wildlife Company, the majority of which probably went unnoticed. The "snake-box trick" is one of the oldest in the animal smuggler's repertoire, and seldom fails.

IPPL has contacted the Department of the Interior and the California Fish and Game Department requesting that the investigation of the 1974 loris smuggling case be reopened, and action taken against whoever rented the San Carlos post office box. The Chief Postal Inspector of the United States has been asked to determine whether such use of a post office box as a front for illegal wildlife transactions constitutes a violation of U.S. mail fraud laws.

"SINGAPORE CONNECTION" UPDATE

The March 1975 issue of the IPPL *Newsletter* told of IPPL's efforts to end the smuggling from Singapore to the United States of primates poached in their homelands of Indonesia, Malaysia, and Thailand. The article listed 51 shipments of gibbons and siamangs (totalling 166 animals) consigned by Singapore dealers to U.S. importers during 1973 and 1974.

Recent efforts to close the "Singapore Connection" have involved activities in several countries.

Singapore. A zoo director assisted IPPL by contacting the Singapore dealer Y. L. Koh for his price list. Koh offered the following primates:

Silver langurs	\$ 45
Spectacled langurs	\$ 55
Celebes Black apes (male)	\$ 50
Celebes Black apes (female)	\$ 90
Agile gibbons	\$150
White-handed gibbons	\$150
Hoolock gibbons	\$150
Black cap gibbons	\$180
Siamangs	\$200

All these animals are non-native to Singapore and legally protected in their homelands. The zoo then contacted Koh expressing interest in obtaining some siamangs and asking whether any problems might be anticipated from U.S. authorities. Koh responded:

so far, we had shipped animals and reptiles into U.S.A. without any problem However, we would like to inform you that the price of siamangs has gone up to U.S. \$250. This is due to strict regulation in the country of origin and also it is becoming very scarce now.

IPPL sent the list of 51 gibbon and siamang shipments to the Prime Minister of Singapore with a request that he initiate an investigation of the situation. The reply, dated 12 April 1976, was signed by B. Rajakrishana "for the Director of Primary Production". The Department of Primary Production has jurisdiction over Singapore's wildlife traffic. The letter stated in entirety:

We thank you for your letter of March 21st, 1976, addressed to the Prime Minister.

2. The list of monkeys (sic) exported from Singapore to the U.S.A. will be checked and appropriate action taken if irregularities are found.

Evidently, Singapore has done nothing about the situation, as a visitor to Singapore inspecting Koh's premises in May 1976 reported

seeing 5 infant siamangs. The assistant in the establishment said that the siamangs, which had been imported from Sumatra, were awaiting shipment to the United Kingdom.

Thailand. In a letter dated 12 May 1976, Khun Pong Leng-EE, Chief of Wildlife Conservation in Thailand, informed IPPL that Singapore's Director of Primary Production, Dr. Siew Teck Woh, had failed to acknowledge Khun Pong's letter of 4 November 1976, in which he proposed that Thailand and Singapore co-operate to end Singapore's traffic in Thai wildlife.

Malaysia. The Chief Game Warden of West Malaysia, Mr. Mohammed Khan, has expressed his appreciation of IPPL's furnishing him with information and documents relating to Singapore's trafficking in gibbons and siamangs. In a letter dated 4 February 1976, he stated that he had sent the list of 51 shipments to all State Game Wardens in West Malaysia with a request that efforts be made to apprehend poachers and smugglers involved in the traffic. Y. L. Koh has admitted to visitors that he traffics in animals from both Indonesia and Malaysia.

Indonesia. IPPL has learned that Indonesia conservation authorities are planning a protest to Singapore about the island's trafficking in gibbons, siamangs, Celebes black apes, and Proboscis monkeys. As early as 1974, Indonesia had tried to get INTERPOL, the international police agency, to investigate the smuggling of its wildlife, especially primates.

United States. IPPL has unsuccessfully tried to get the Department of the Interior's Division of Law Enforcement to take legal action against Singapore shipments of non-native wildlife. On 11 March 1976, Mr. Ruby Compton and Mr. Thomas Stael, attorneys with the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC), citing the Lacey Act and the Endangered Species Convention, called for action against shipments of non-indigenous wildlife from Singapore. On 26 April 1976, Ms. Compton and Mr. Stael, citing the Traffic Act of 1930, requested the Secretary of the Treasury to instruct the U.S. Customs to take action against such shipments. IPPL greatly appreciates the assistance of NRDC's excellent lawyers.

United Kingdom. IPPL has learned that the United Kingdom has recently allowed two shipments of "Singapore Connection" primates to enter the country unchallenged.

1. *March 1976.* Two gibbons were shipped from Singapore to the Ravensden Zoo, a wildlife trading company in England. They were carried on KLM Air Waybill 074-8462-8810.

2. *31 May, 1976.* Two siamangs were shipped by Chop Jin Seng, of Rochore Road, Singapore, to the Ravensden Zoo on KLM Air Waybill 074-8464-7290. (Chop Jin Seng, reportedly a major orang-utan smuggler in the 1950s and 60s, is the father of the notorious wildlife trafficker, Christopher Wee of the Singapore pet Farm.)

IPPL has requested British authorities to investigate these shipments, and is seeking to learn how many "Singapore Connection" shipments have been sent to the U.K. in recent years.

It appears that the Singapore situation is at a stalemate. However, an official in the Conservation Department of one of the countries victimised by the Singapore trafficking has proposed that two further approaches be explored; first, trying to get the issue resolved within the framework of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), but subsequently:

If Singapore refuses to co-operate, there is still one avenue left. Singapore is sensitive to only one thing and that is money. A large part of her earnings are from tourism and travel services. It may be possible to publicise Singapore's part in the wildlife trade and request conservation-minded tourists and travellers in the U.S., France, Germany and England (for a start) to avoid Singapore either as a transit or terminal point if possible. I feel that, faced with just the threat of this, we will see a rapid change of heart in that island state.

Further developments will be reported in future IPPL *Newsletters*.

**MAKE EVERY NEWSLETTER COUNT!
PASS THIS COPY AROUND!!**

Sept
Dec 1976

ZOOS AND SURPLUS PRIMATES

Two recent incidents have focused attention on the important question of how zoos should dispose of surplus primates. The first incident involved the attempted sale of 2 gibbons to a cancer laboratory by the San Antonio Zoo, and the second involved a completed sale of a gibbon to the same laboratory by the San Diego Zoo. Details of the two incidents and an explanation of how one zoo handles this problem follow.

SALE BLOCKED

The 1 February 1976 issue of *Current Primate References*, a bibliography circulated mainly to primate researchers, contained an announcement by the San Antonio Zoo. Among other primates, the zoo offered for sale a female Hoolock gibbon *Hylobates hoolock* and an infant white-handed gibbon *Hylobates lar*. The zoo was contacted by Dr. Thomas Kawakami, Director of the Comparative Oncology Laboratory at the University of California at Davis. The laboratory is under federal investigation for possible violation of the Lacey Act in connection with a series of gibbon importations in 1973 and 1974. The zoo agreed to sell both gibbons to the laboratory. However, the sale was cancelled when IPPL, the Fund for Animals, the Humane Society of the United States, and other animal welfare groups protested. As a result, the Hoolock gibbon remains at the San Antonio Zoo. The infant white-handed gibbon was subsequently sold to the Alexandria Zoo in Louisiana, whose Director, Robert White, informed IPPL in a letter dated 20 July 1976 that the zoo had no intention of reselling the gibbon, but had placed it with a young female already in the collection.

Since all gibbons have now been added to the U.S. Endangered List, movement of gibbons between U.S. states for commercial purposes now requires prior issuance of a permit from the Department of the Interior.

Note. IPPL informed the editor of *Current Primate References* that offers to sell endangered species of primate might be in violation of the Endangered Species Act which makes it illegal to offer for sale any endangered animal without a prior permit. As a result, the bibliography carries a weekly announcement of this fact.

SALE COMPLETED



In the course of investigating the situation at the San Antonio Zoo, IPPL learned that the Comparative Oncology Laboratory had a male White-cheeked gibbon *Hylobates concolor* in quarantine. An investigation revealed that this gibbon had been sold to the laboratory by the San Diego Zoo. IPPL asked Clyde Hill, Curator of Mammals at the San Diego Zoo, to justify this sale of a primate belonging to an endangered species to a laboratory performing cancer research, and which had no female White-cheeked gibbon in any case. Extracts from Hill's letters dated 14 April 1976, 3 June 1976 and 14 July 1976, follow.

His mate, the only female gibbon in our collection, died of a bone infection . . . Since there were 17 females (at Davis) chances were excellent he would be able to find a compatible mate . . . We have a letter from their Director stating, "the animal will not be used in experimentation which might alter its physiology or behavior" . . . The shipment of gibbons to U.C. Davis which you find objectionable happened five years ago . . . Often marvellous opportunities develop which could not be realised at the time of acceptance of the pet.

This last comment refers to the fact that the gibbon had been donated to the zoo by a naval officer who had brought his pet gibbon back with him from Vietnam. IPPL has tried to learn the name of this officer, who may well have imagined that, by giving his gibbon to the San Diego Zoo, he was assuring it a permanent home in a fine zoo. Hill's response to IPPL's request for the identity of the donor was, "You would be naive if you expect me to give you the name of the sailor who donated the animal to the zoo."

IPPL is not satisfied with the zoo's justifications for this sale. Since the Comparative Oncology Laboratory has no female White-cheeked gibbon, any offspring would be hybrid animals and hence nothing would be accomplished for the conservation of the species of either parent. Further, a letter stating that the animal would not be used in experimentation has no legal validity, nor does the latter contain any guarantee that any offspring would not be inoculated with cancer. Such inoculation of infant animals has been part of the research program at the Comparative Oncology Laboratory. The shipments under investigation occurred 2-3 years ago, not 5 years ago as Hill asserts, and might well be continuing to this day but for IPPL's revelations.

The status of the White-cheeked gibbon is uncertain, although it was known to be rare even before war, with its attendant bombing and defoliation, had devastated much of its habitat range which included Vietnam and Laos. IPPL therefore considers that the San Diego Zoo should have kept the gibbon and made strenuous efforts to locate a female of the same species.

A ZOO WITH A POLICY

IPPL has been able to learn of only one zoo with a clear written policy on the disposal of surplus primates. This is the New York Zoological Park (Bronx Zoo). The policy states in part:

Living animals may be disposed of by sale, exchange or gift to another zoo or aquarium or other qualified institution. Care should be taken to insure that the recipient institution will provide good care for the specimens and will not merely serve as a way-station to yet another institution. Insofar as is practicable, animals should be placed in another tax-exempt public institution wherein they may serve purposes consistent with those of the New York Zoological Society . . . Living animals may be disposed of to a research institution for observational purposes only and not for stressful biomedical research.

IPPL takes the position that all zoos establish written legally binding policies for the disposal of surplus primates, whether endangered or not. Both the San Antonio and San Diego zoos have been granted Endangered Species permits by the Department of the Interior in the past. It appears that these zoos want to be able to acquire endangered animals on "conservation" grounds, yet be free to dispose of primates opportunistically. Since applications for Endangered Species permits are published in the Federal Register and opened for public comments, IPPL will oppose any application for an Endangered Species permit by any zoo known to have sold an endangered primate to a research facility for any purpose.

It is suggested that IPPL members living in towns with zoos find out whether their zoo has a written policy on this matter, and how primates have been disposed of in the past. Should no policy exist, efforts should be made to establish one. Please keep us informed of your progress.

THE CHIMPANZEE AND KURU

The chimpanzee is an endangered primate. Kuru is an "endangered disease." Confined to remote areas of the Eastern Highlands of New Guinea, this fatal neurological disorder now affects less than a hundred

Sept 1976

people a year, and is disappearing with the ritual cannibalism which causes it.

Yet the National Institute of Health have inoculated no less than 126 chimpanzees with kuru. The work is continuing at the National Institute of Neurological Diseases, Communicative Disorder and Stroke, Bethesda, Maryland, U.S.A. IPPL contacted the Institute seeking details of the research and a justification for inoculating chimpanzees with kuru, a disease which affects so few. The official response dated 8 July 1976, came from Donald Tower, M.D., the Institute's Director. The most important parts of Dr. Tower's statement follow.

Initially the chimpanzee was selected over other primates because it proved to be the only species susceptible to subacute degenerative disease of the human brain

The scientists have reported that every effort is being made to transmit the disease to non-primate hosts (and) old world and new world monkeys

During the past 14 years, a total of 126 chimpanzees have been inoculated with kuru. Of these, 51 have developed the disease and died, while 75 remain alive and unaffected

According to the investigators, the incubation period in chimpanzees has varied greatly. Generally, the animals are sacrificed when the first symptoms appear

Kuru has continued to disappear with fewer deaths being reported each year since the cessation of the practice of ritual cannibalism. The death rate has dropped from 63 in 1973 to 6 thus far in 1976

Therefore, while no cure for kuru has been found, a method of preventing has helped greatly to reduce its incidence. However, the finding that kuru is caused by a slow latent virus is one of the major milestones in medical history . . . and a considerable number of neurological disorders affecting hundreds of millions of people around the world are being screened for evidence of the same or similar slow viral involvement.

The facts surrounding the selection of the chimpanzee as the primary "animal model" for kuru studies are unclear. According to Drs. Clarence Gibbs and Carleton Gajusek, the two principal researchers in the kuru program, kuru has also been found transmissible to capuchin monkeys, marmosets, spider monkeys, squirrel monkeys, woolly monkeys, crab-eating monkeys, mangabeys, rhesus macaques, bonnet macaques and pigtail macaques. (Gibbs, C. J., and Gajusek, D. C., Studies of the viruses of subacute spongiform encephalopathies using primates, Scientific Publication No. 317, Pan American Health Union). This statement appears to conflict with Dr. Tower's statement that "the only species susceptible to subacute degenerative disease of the brain is the chimpanzee." It also raises the question of why these commoner species were not used in the first place, assuming that the work is necessary and desirable. The Gibbs-Gajusek article reports that the incubation period for kuru in the chimpanzee is 10 to 82 months, and the clinical course of the disease is 1 to 15 months. Therefore it is probable that more cases will develop among the 75 as yet unaffected chimpanzees. The article also notes that chimpanzees have been inoculated with scrapie, a sheep disease, and encephalopathy of minks.

IPPL believes that the National Institutes of Health should set up an independent investigating committee to determine whether it was really necessary to transmit an incurable disease to such a large number of chimpanzees.

IN SHORT

Four more countries have joined the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Fauna and Flora, joining the 22 nations which are already members. They are West Germany, Papua New Guinea, Pakistan and Finland.

News from Gombe Stream Research Center

Dr. Jane Goodall reports that all is well with the chimpanzees in the Gombe National Park, Tanzania. Fifi, who was an infant animal when Dr. Goodall began to study the Gombe chimpanzees 16 years ago, gave birth to her second infant on the night of 29/30 June 1975. Dr. Goodall reports, "Freud (the first infant) has adjusted very well to the new infant with its new demands on his mother's attention, his name

Thailand Bans Primate Export

Khun Pong Leng-EE, Chief of Wildlife Conservation in Thailand, has informed IPPL that Thailand has banned the hunting, trading and export of all non-human primates. The measure took effect on 1 February 1976. IPPL has written to congratulate Khun Pong on this new policy which will relieve all primate species, especially the threatened Stumptail macaque of the heavy hunting pressures of the past few years when the annual macaque export quota was 6000. Khun Pong has since reported to IPPL (25 July 1976) that, "there is great pressure from the animal dealers opposing the new regulations . . . an appeal has been sent to the Minister (of Agriculture) so that they can export some macaque species."

Guyana Bans Wildlife Export

The March 1976 issue of the IPPL *Newsletter* told how 12 Sakiwinki monkeys (genus *Pithecia*) were smuggled out of Guyana as part of a shipment to a dealer in West Germany. The monkeys, which were concealed in small compartments in the rear of reptile crates, were detected by the staff of the RSPCA Hostel at London Airport during a transit stop. Two of the 12 monkeys were dead, the rest in poor condition.

Mr. Peter Fernandes, Principal Agricultural Officer of the Ministry of Agriculture of the Government of Guyana informed IPPL in a letter dated 8 June 1976 that, as a result of this incident, Guyana has placed a total ban on the export of all wildlife and established a Committee for the Conservation and Protection of Wildlife to review the entire situation and make recommendations for a future conservation policy.

From the Indian Press

Dr. S. M. Mohnot, IPPL's representative for Central and West India has sent IPPL a copy of a "Letter to the Editor" which appeared in the *Patriot*, an Indian daily newspaper, on 2 December 1975. The writer, Dr. S. M. Yadav of Aligarh Muslim University, commented:

Recently a symposium was held in New Delhi under the auspices of the Indian National Science Academy to discuss the use of primates in medical research. A large number of foreign scientists were invited from the U.S. and West Europe, but the whole show was dominated by Americans who came in impressive strength. The Soviet Union and the East European block were excluded Those who attended the Conference feel that the contributions were of mixed quality and that the principal object of calling the Symposium was not a serious discussion of primate information but the sponsoring of a so-called Institute for Monkey Research in India. What advantage, if any, India will see from the establishment of such an institute is not clear . . . such an institute is bound to be dominated by foreigners and Indian scientists will only play a very subordinate role . . . the government should therefore be very careful before accepting such proposals.

PRIMATES ACCIDENTALLY POISONED IN CANADA

Eleven crab-eating macaques *Macaca fascicularis* in excellent health were accidentally poisoned at the Animal Research Facility of the University of Saskatchewan, Canada. The animals were being used in "nutritional study involving a moderately high fat diet", according to the account of the incident carried in the *Laboratory Primate Newsletter* (October 1975). After being on the experimental diet for a few days, monkeys began to develop tongue erosions, eruptions on the skin of the tail, nail loss and weakness. It took over three weeks to discover that the animals had been fed 100 times the required amount of selenium in the experimental food mixture. All monkeys recovered when the diet was corrected. However, 3 of the monkeys were sacrificed four weeks later, presumably to check for internal damage. None was found. IPPL has since learned that the senior author of the article describing this incident, Dr. F. M. Loew, is a Director of the Saskatchewan Society for the Protection of Animals (SPCA) and the Canadian Federation of Humane Societies as well as a member of the Animal Care Assessment Panel of the Canadian Council on Animal Care. A request for further information on this accident addressed to the Director of the University of Saskatchewan Animal Research

Sept
1976

ORANG-UTANS IMPORTED TO CANADA

The orang-utan *Pongo pygmaeus* is one of the rarest of primates. Numbers remaining in the wild are estimated to be less than 10,000. The species is entirely protected in its homelands of Indonesia and East Malaysia. Because of strict monitoring of the orang-utan trade, few reach the market. IPPL has learned that nonetheless, two orang-utans were imported to Canada by the Ark Animal Exchange in October 1974. The Ark Animal Exchange, which is managed by Mr. Kenneth Clare, has been responsible for shipping gibbons, siamangs, and other primates illegally exported from their homelands to the United States. IPPL therefore asked the Canadian Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Eugene Whelan, to investigate this shipment.

Whelan's reply dated 3 May 1976, stated that 2 orang-utans were imported to Canada in October 1974 by the Granby Zoo, with Kenneth Clare acting as agent, but he ignored the question about the origin of the animals. Similarly, M. Marcel Leclerc, Director of Operations at the Granby Zoo, confirmed in a letter dated 23 June 1976 that the zoo had imported two young orang-utans, but ignored the question about the country of origin of the animals. IPPL is also looking into a report that the Ark Animal Exchange has been importing Lion-tail macaques into Canada. The Liontail macaque *Macaca silenus* is also one of the rarest of primates. Although its export from its homeland of India has been totally banned for many years, some specimens nonetheless find their way on to the Singapore blackmarket. It is becoming clear that Canada has been a major destination for smuggled wildlife in recent years, allowing it in freely. At the same time, Canada has been a member of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature since 1968. Unfortunately, such a two-faced outlook is very common in international conservation circles.

COLOBUS DEATHS AT TORONTO ZOO

In November 1975, the entire colony of Black and White Colobus monkeys at the Metro Toronto Zoo died. The Black and White Colobus *colobus geereza* is the attractive leaf-eating monkey of East Africa. The species was almost wiped out around the turn of the century when "monkey fur" was a fashion rage. The Toronto colony consisted of a breeding pair and its offspring and 10 newly-imported animals from Kenya purchased from the International Animal Exchange.

In May 1976, 12 more Colobus monkeys arrived at the zoo from East Africa. The supplier was again the International Animal Exchange. Within 2 weeks, all these monkeys were also dead. In a "Letter to the Editor" of the Toronto *Star* dated 25 May 1976, Ms. Marlene Lakin, Canadian Representative of the Fund for Animals, commented:

Colobus monkeys are known to have high mortality rates in captivity and I feel it is totally irresponsible of the zoo to have ordered this recent shipment. Metro Zoo has stated that one of its objectives is to preserve rare species. In the case of the Colobus monkey, it would seem to be part of the cause of their decline.

PRIMATE LOSSES AT MADRID ZOO

A correspondent recently drew IPPL's attention to the high primate mortality rate at Madrid Zoo. A partial list of losses over a 1-year period included:

- 2 of 3 gorillas *Gorilla gorilla*
- 6 of 10 Guinea baboons *Papio papio*
- 5 of 8 mandrills *Mandrillus sphinx*
- 2 of 2 drills *Mandrillus leucophaeus*
- 5 of 8 Crab-eating macaques *Macaca fascicularis*
- 6 of 6 African green monkeys *Cercopithecus sabaeus*

Our correspondent attributes these deaths to (1) a contaminated water supply, (2) inadequate or no heating in winter, (3) a diet composed mainly of carrots and apples or oranges, with an occasional hard-boiled egg, banana or peanut, and (4) lack of any staff member qualified to handle primates.

Over a 2-year period, 11 of 15 gibbons (imported consecutively as animals in previous shipments died), lost their lives at the zoo. They lived on an island surrounded by contaminated water which they had to drink as no fresh water was available, and slept in wooden sleeping boxes with heaters... which had broken down several years previously.

IPPL has asked Dr. Ernst Lang, Director of Basel Zoo, to look into this situation. Dr. Lang is the International Union of Zoo Directors' representative to the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN).

FRANK THOMPSON NOMINATED FOR
AAZPA ETHICS COMMITTEE

IPPL has learned that Frank Thompson, an animal dealer who is also Director of the Jacksonville Zoo in Florida, is one of 10 nominees for 5 places on the Ethics Committee of the American Association of Zoological Parks and Aquaria (AAZPA). Thompson imported 48 siamangs *Symphalangus syndactylus* to the U.S.A. between August 1973 and November 1974, and is reported to have continued trading this species although statistics are not yet available. All the shipments originated in Singapore. Since the siamang is not indigenous to Singapore, IPPL contends that this series of shipments may have violated the Lacey Act prohibition against importation of animals exported in violation of the laws of any country, since both Indonesia and Malaysia, the only countries with resident siamang populations, have total bans on their commercial export. Siamangs traded from Singapore are usually smuggled to the island in coastal fishing boats and freighters.

In addition to questioning the legality of these shipments, IPPL questions the ethics of any traffic in species caught, like siamangs, by the killing of their mothers, with several mothers and infants dying for each specimen brought into captivity. IPPL therefore questions whether Mr. Thompson is a desirable individual to preside over any Ethics Committee and has drawn the attention of the AAZPA to his dealings in siamangs.

An IPPL member independently sent a list of Mr. Thompson's siamang shipments to the AAZPA with a request that the nomination be reconsidered. She received the following reply from Mr. George Felton, Director of the Baton Rouge Zoo, Louisiana.

I, as acting chairman of the Ethics Committee of the AAZPA, have been asked to correspond with you concerning your letter of July 15 concerning Mr. Frank Thompson's fitness to serve on the Ethics Committee.

I, first, would have to ask you to more fully explain yourself as to what you are actually charging Mr. Thompson with. Are you in fact saying that he illegally imported Gibbons? Are you saying these were legal importations that you disapprove of?

I would be forced to think from the information you did forward including air bill numbers, etc. that in all cases these were legal imports and if that is the case I can in no way see where ethical behavior is a point in question.

Mr. Felton is, like Mr. Thompson, a candidate for the AAZPA Ethics Committee, which is somewhat disquieting as Mr. Felton does not appear to know the meaning of the word "ethics", equating it with legality.

CONFERENCE IN LIMA

The first International Conference on the Conservation and Utilization of American Nonhuman Primates was held in Lima, Peru from 2-4 June 1975. The conference, which was attended by 70 delegates from the U.S.A. and several South American countries, was sponsored by the Pan American Health Organization, the regional office of the World Health Organisation (WHO). However, the financing came from the Merck Sharp Dohme Pharmaceutical Company and the U.S. National Institutes of Health, both major consumers of South American primates. The conference was scheduled at a time when Brazil, Colombia and Peru, formerly the principal exporters of South American primates, had established total bans on the capture and export of primates. The occasion permitted U.S. researchers using South American primates to present papers describing their work to an audience of influential South American government officials and researchers, and to plead for a steady supply of nonhuman primates. The Conference produced a series of recommendations such as the establishment of breeding colonies both in habitat and user countries, the encouragement of biomedical research activities within the habitat countries and the necessity to publicise the role of primates in biomedical research. It is not clear who wrote the Recommendations.

Dec
1976

and whether they were unanimously approved. Nor is it clear whether WHO, by lending its name and prestige to a conference financed by organizations with a vested interest in continued availability of primates, was endorsing patterns of primate utilization seen in the U.S.A. in recent years. An illustrative example is the fate of the 1554 Moustached tamarins imported to the U.S.A. for research in 1973. Only 26 of the animals (1.6%) were alive at the end of the year. (Source, *Nonhuman Primates*, National Academy of Sciences, 1975). Ironically, most of these animals had been sacrificed in hepatitis research by the Merck Sharp Dohme Company, one of the financial supporters of the Conference. Not a single animal was placed into a breeding program.

The Conference Proceedings are available from the Pan American Health Organisation, 525 23rd St. N.W. Washington, D.C. 20037, U.S.A.

CHICO'S MONKEY FARM

A Newsletter reader has sent in the following report. Other readers observing primates maintained in unsatisfactory conditions are requested to send details to IPPL.

"Off the main north-south highway to Florida (Route 95), about 25 miles from Atlanta, in the town of Richmond Hill, Georgia, is 'Chico's Monkey Farm.' Several years ago, visitors found chimpanzees there chained to their cages. Due to pressure these visitors exerted on the U.S. government, this monstrous parlour was halted.

"However, Chico's still has a long way to go to provide decent standards for its animals. As a recent visitor, I observed a solitary baboon in a narrow cage about a yard wide, which was confining its movements to a jerking motion right and left.

"Chico's billboard advertisements, strung out for miles on Route 95, feature 'The Great Gargantua.' This unfortunate beast turned out to be a chimpanzee kept alone in an old circus wagon in an isolated area. The wagon was divided into two cages, one housing the chimp and the other empty. One would have thought that the management at least would have had the compassion to remove the separating bars between the cages so as to allow the animal space to exercise. In any event, the isolation was such as to drive virtually any mammal, particularly one as intelligent as the chimpanzee, insane."

The U.S. Department of Agriculture under the Zoos and Circuses Amendment to the Animal Welfare Act is entrusted with enforcing

minimum standards for animal displays. Therefore, readers interested in improving the conditions for animals at Chico's Monkey Farm or other establishments should write to:

Dr. Dale Schwindaman
Senior Staff Veterinarian
U.S. Department of Agriculture
APHIS, Room 769
Hyattsville, Maryland 20782.

IPPL AND THE HABITAT

All over the world, primate habitat is being destroyed at an alarming rate. The main reasons for this habitat destruction are:

1. commercial logging
2. primitive slash and burn agricultural techniques, and
3. land clearance to produce food for expanding populations

There is little IPPL can do in the area of population control and modernization of agriculture. However, much of the current destruction of forest in countries such as Indonesia is for the purpose of producing wood for export. In Indonesia, for example, much of the logging is done by U.S. and Japanese companies. Both clear-cutting and selective logging are practised. Most of the profits from the destruction of the forests of Borneo and Sumatra go overseas. In many countries, the problem of legal logging is compounded by large-scale log-poaching activities, sometimes officially "protected".

IPPL therefore suggests that members concerned about destruction of primate habitat avoid buying furniture or other products made of tropical hardwoods. Strangely, many people who would never directly harm a primate fill their homes with furniture made from primates' destroyed homes.

IPPL is also considering the possibility of proposing teak and other tropical woods for addition to the U.S. Endangered List in order to limit their importation to the U.S.A. We are consulting with other groups about the desirability and practicability of this suggestion.

IPPL is interested in members' comments on these suggestions, as well as data which might be useful in developing a specific proposal to submit to the U.S. Department of the Interior. Information and suggestions would also be welcome as to how undisturbed tropical forest is being made, or might be made, attractive to tourists.

IPPL OFFICIALS

Chairwomen: Dr. Shirley McGreal, Ardith Eudey

Secretary: Anne Denney Jones Treasurer: Don Miller

*Field Representatives: S. T. Baskaram (South India), Vijay Bhatia (North India), Dellef and Walai Blumel (Cameroun), Gombe Stream Research Center (Tanzania), Sumit Hemsaul and Viroj Pruesanusak (Thailand), Henry Heymann (Washington), Sonia Jeffrey (Liberia), Jean Martin (Canada), Anna Merz (Kenya), Dr. S. M. Mahnot (Central and West India), Maria Alice Fernandes Nehab (Brazil), Senor Carlos Ponce del Prado and Dr. Rogerio Castro (Peru), O. Reussien (Netherlands), Cyril Rosen (United Kingdom), Charles Shuttleworth (Taiwan), Professor J. D. Skinner (South Africa), Dr. Akira Suzuki (Japan).

Local Contacts: Professor Dao Van Tien (Democratic Republic of Vietnam), Fred Hechtel (Hong Kong).

Advisory Board: Dr. James Alcock, Dr. Frances Burton, K. Kalyan Gogoi, Dr. Jane Goodall, Dr. Colin Groves, Dr. Barbara Harrison, Lim Boo Liat, Dr. William McGrew, Dr. Vernon Reynolds, Dr. Arthur Westing.

Consultant: Dr. H. Ebner (South West Africa)

Sept
1976

HOW TO JOIN

Complete the form below and mail it with a cheque payable to the International Primate Protection League, to either: IPPL, PO Box 9086, Berkeley, Ca. 94709, or IPPL, Regent Arcade House, 19-25 Argyll Street, London W1V 2DU, England.

I wish to join IPPL as a () Sustaining Member — \$25.00 or £15.00
 () Regular Member — \$ 7.50 or £ 5.00
 () Student Member — \$ 3.00 or £ 1.50

I wish to subscribe to the IPPL Newsletter — \$7.50 or £5

Name

Street City State

Code Country

Please suggest names of people who would like to receive a complimentary newsletter.

Name

Street City State

Code Country

International Primate Protection League
 PO Box 9086,
 Berkeley, Ca. 94709,
 U.S.A.

U.K. Office:
 IPPL,
 19-25 Argyll Street,
 London W1V 2DU, England.

Sept
 Dec 1976