

Money for Monkeys, and More: Ensuring Sanctuary Retirement of Nonhuman Primates

Erika Fleury

North American Primate Sanctuary Alliance

Abstract: *Reputable animal sanctuaries have existed for decades, yet it is only in more recent years that their work has been validated by the oversight of accreditation bodies and sanctuary coalitions. Through these relationships, sanctuaries are able to differentiate themselves from roadside zoos and private owners. Sanctuaries exist solely to provide enriched lifetime care to animals retired or rescued from exploitation or mistreatment, and thus their missions and facility management differ greatly from those of zoos, farms, circuses and other for-profit, entertainment, research and educational institutions. Primate sanctuaries specifically are more in demand than ever before due to the mass exodus of chimpanzees from laboratories and an increase in demand to retire research monkeys, in addition to a heightened public scrutiny of the ways that all nonhuman primate species are utilized by the entertainment, exotic pet trade and biomedical research industries. The sanctuary community has great resources, such as experience and expertise, yet placement efforts can be limited by finances. Requests to provide sanctuary to primates are at an all-time high. Effective collaboration (including financial support) between owners seeking placement of their animals and those able to accept primates into retirement is necessary to ensure the continued services of the sanctuary community. Instead of owners scrambling to procure minimal funding at the time retirement is required, proactive financial planning should begin years ahead of the intended placement. In instances involving the commercialized and industrialized use of primates, such as in laboratory settings (where the highest demand for sanctuary currently originates), this can be accomplished with the inclusion of retirement funding in research grant proposals and strategic plans. Such forethought is the only way to ensure that primate sanctuaries will remain available for the primate retirements that inevitably await in the future.*

Keywords: *Primate sanctuary, sanctuary retirement, primate retirement, monkey, ape, nonhuman primate, primate research, primate entertainer, primate pet*

Introduction

Nonhuman primates (hereafter, primates) have been exploited by humans throughout history for virtually as long as the latter was aware of the former's existence. Unethical treatment by humans has persisted to the current day due to primates' forced roles in laboratory research, entertainment and the exotic pet trade industry. Their involvement in such practices results in primates living lives that are socially and psychologically stunted at best, and painful and terrifying at worst.

Although primates are merely one of many nonhuman species forced to serve human needs, there are a number of reasons why primates specifically have been subjugated to such a degree. The intelligence and dexterity of primates, as well as their physical similarity to humans (who are, of course, primates themselves) captivate humans' attention and contribute to their desirability as subjects of exhibit. The scrutiny persists beyond the penetrating gaze; many primates' smaller body sizes permit physical domination by humans. This is possible throughout their lifetimes for smaller primates but only during infancy for great apes, after which point humans have relied on weapons and other tools to counter the strength of sub-adult and adult apes. Primates lack a common spoken language, thus nonhuman primates are not successful when they verbally protest against injustice or instances when their needs go unmet. The sounds they make fall on deaf (by choice) ears. It is not difficult to imagine what might be going through the mind of exploited primates, yet most humans are blinded by speciesism.

Humans have managed to poach, train, manipulate, physically harm and abuse these animals, often with the justification that species membership is cause enough for the practices to exist and persist. It can no longer be denied that primates suffer when coerced into unnatural activities. It has been argued that none of the justifications for keeping primates captive are tenable – even laboratory research. Although proponents of biomedical primate research justify the practice with references to the genetic similarities between all primates and the resulting benefits to human health, a growing body of literature has found overriding ethical concerns (Conlee and Rowan). The implementation of required councils such as Institutional Animal Care and Use Committees, who review animal use and welfare in federally funded research in the United States (National Institutes of Health Office of Extramural Research) and Animal

Ethics Committees, who review all animal use in research or teaching in Australia (NSW Dept. of Primary Industries) serve important functions but have been criticized as not being fully effective at recognizing or thwarting all the threats to laboratory animal welfare (Varga). The public is alarmed that conservation of wild primate species continues to be severely threatened due to poaching, shrinking home ranges, and other effects of human encroachment (Zimmer). As a result of this growing awareness of primate welfare, some of the industries that have caused the most harm to captive primates have been outlawed (National Institutes of Health; Michigan State University) or have experienced a rapid decline in support (Ragan). As the use of some species of primates dwindles in laboratory research and the use of all species diminishes in entertainment and the exotic pet industries, refuge is needed for individuals who might otherwise be considered little more than an industry's surplus goods. A home is needed for this 'overstock' that happens to come equipped with a very long lifespan and a unique sense of self.

Thankfully, there exist sanctuaries that are able to provide enriched lifetime care to primates who have outlived humans' intentions for them. Whether they were the subjects of research, entertainers, or were privately owned and living as 'pets', these individuals have diverse needs. Their care in retirement is not generic. Primate sanctuaries are experts in the care of retired primates from all forms of exploitation and recognize that an animal's care must be personalized and tailored for it to be even remotely functional. As sanctuaries successfully care for large populations, they are finding their services more in demand than ever before (Jungle Friends, 'Welcome Signs'). It is clear that the future of primate retirement will be one of growth and expansion. In order for primate sanctuaries to provide lifetime care to the population of retired primates that awaits, funding must accompany the animals into retirement. Primate sanctuaries are sought-after now and will be an indispensable factor in the ethical handling of primates going forward. This paper addresses how best to ensure their future. It will focus mainly on primate sanctuaries in the United States, although it should be noted that many of the concerns discussed (including the need for funding and ending exploitative industries) are relevant to other countries as well.

North American Primate Sanctuary Histories

In order to understand the evolution and future of primate sanctuaries, one must first examine their provenance. The history of primate sanctuaries in North America seems to have formed in two segments. The first phase of growth began in the 1970s and ran through the mid-1990s. In the 1970s and 1980, there were few laws, if any, restricting private ownership of exotic animals. It was easy to buy a ‘pet’ monkey or ape in almost every state and country, but meeting the needs of this animal, and desiring to do so for the 30 to 60 years that comprise primate lifespans was difficult to sustain. The problem was that primates were being bred and bought as companion animals but were not often kept as ‘pets’ for very long. Discarded primate ‘pets’ needed a place to go. In a select few locations, someone who had either purchased a primate or been handed a confiscated or surrendered ‘pet’ actually *did* desire to provide proper care and housing for their animal. As word spread, such people found themselves quickly being handed more unwanted primates. Slowly, these home-based operations turned into non-profit organizations and official primate sanctuaries. For example, the Primate Rescue Center, a sanctuary in Kentucky, was formed after its co-founders purchased a crab-eating macaque as a ‘pet’, then the couple later adopted an aging companion for their young macaque, and in the process discovered a large population of once-beloved pet monkeys who had outgrown their welcome as they got older, stronger, and more unpredictable. So they built more cages for some of those unwanted primates, and before long they also agreed to provide homes for retired laboratory animals, a monkey who had injured its owner, and some illegally owned pets who had been confiscated by authorities (Primate Rescue Center, ‘Frequently’). Florida sanctuary Jungle Friends Primate Sanctuary had similar roots, as its founder developed it in response to need to house ‘pet’ monkeys (Jungle Friends, ‘How It All Began’).

Even early on, many of the founders of such sanctuaries were involved in advocacy. It was clear that tighter legislation regulating trade in primates was the only solution to the seemingly unending flow of ‘pet’ primates being churned out by breeders and being poached from the wilds of Africa, Asia and South America. At this time, primates were in active use in research laboratories and in training for entertainment performances. Although monkeys and apes from those industries would end up in sanctuaries from time to time, sanctuaries were mostly filled with the unwanted inventory of the exotic pet breeders and sellers. When the

sanctuaries tried to convince laboratories and entertainers to retire their primates during these years, there were some successes but mostly a lack thereof. These industries were profitable and were not yet experiencing much negative publicity related to their practices, thus there was very little impetus for anything to change.

Beginning in the mid-1980s, a radical shift took place. During these years, animal rights groups began going undercover to infiltrate and expose industries that exploited primates, including Hollywood animal trainers, Las Vegas sideshows (Peterson and Goodall 147, 155-179), circuses, and biomedical laboratories (Francione 179). Awareness of primate suffering due to living highly unnatural, often solitary lives turned more of the public against these practices. Although they continued to exist, demand dwindled for some of the exploitive industries and there was less of a justification for animals to be imported, bred, or held captive for these purposes.

Another factor majorly impacting the development of primate sanctuaries was the sudden and unexpected closure of New York University's Laboratory for Experimental Medicine and Surgery in Primates (LEMSIP) in 1996. The facility housed close to 200 chimpanzees who required quick sanctuary placement or they would be sent to the Coulston Foundation, a notorious New Mexico laboratory with a very poor reputation for animal welfare. Primate sanctuaries scrambled to save chimpanzees from a dark future at Coulston. One hundred chimpanzees ended up being placed at North American sanctuaries and the remaining half were sent to the Coulston Foundation (Primate Rescue Center). Primate sanctuary chimpanzee populations swelled as a result, even at sanctuaries that had previously only housed monkeys. North American sanctuaries began establishing themselves as experts in the care of chimpanzees, including those from LEMSIP and others who would arrive later on.

The second phase of primate sanctuary development began in the early 2000s and runs up to the current day. During this time it became clear that it no longer was necessary to plead for animals to be retired from labs and entertainment. Sanctuaries were finally on the receiving end of the plaintive requests. They began getting a larger percentage of their residents from sources other than the pet trade, including laboratories (Taylor; Bagnall, 'Research Retirement' 2015) and the entertainment industry. For example, as recently as the 1990s, there were more

than 100 chimpanzees and over 35 orangutans being used in entertainment by 40 to 50 trainers. In 2016 there were only 13 chimpanzees and 10 orangutans working for just five trainers (Ragan). The increase in demand, as well as changing legal protections for primates, affected the strategic plans for the futures of primate sanctuaries.

Chimpanzees had been purposefully bred in United States laboratories for decades (Blum 212), but when the National Institutes of Health (NIH) accepted an Institutes of Medicine report in 2011 stating that ‘most current use of chimpanzees for biomedical research is unnecessary’ (Institute of Medicine and National Research Council) following reports that chimpanzees were not, after all, turning out to be accurate models for research benefiting human health, it was clear that there was a large-scale adjustment looming on the horizon for chimpanzee laboratories. One year prior, 2010’s Chimpanzee Health Improvement, Maintenance and Protection (CHIMP) Act stipulated that all federally owned research chimpanzees would be retired to Chimp Haven (the National Chimpanzee Sanctuary) in Louisiana (Project R&R ‘The CHIMP Act’). The foundation for chimpanzee retirement was prepared, but things really sped up in 2015 when captive chimpanzees were declared endangered (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service) and the NIH announced that chimpanzee research would no longer be funded (National Institutes of Health). Although the CHIMP Act did much for federally owned chimpanzees, the fate of privately owned research chimps remained unclear until 2016, when New Iberia Research Center, the world’s largest chimpanzee research facility, announced that it would retire all of its 220 chimpanzees to sanctuaries (Grimm). This represented the majority of privately owned research chimpanzees and made clear that chimpanzee research in the United States was ending.

In anticipation of an end to this form of exploitation for chimpanzees, sanctuaries prepared for an influx of laboratory retirees. However, chimpanzee retirement is a notoriously slow process. Although space was and still is available in reputable sanctuaries, as of this writing hundreds of chimpanzees remain in laboratories awaiting retirement (ChimpCare). The speed of chimpanzee retirement depends upon the arrangement of many details regarding funding, animal care, and release from institutions, all of which take much time and coordination. Chimpanzees are currently being retired to sanctuaries, though the retirement process is

proceeding more slowly than anticipated. After it was clear that chimpanzee retirement from laboratories is guaranteed (though its timeframe is not), attention naturally led to the many thousands of other primate species still living captive lives who are just as deserving of enriched sanctuary retirement.

As sanctuaries and public awareness of their work expand, it has become necessary for sanctuaries to differentiate themselves from other places that care for captive primates. There is no law (in the United States or elsewhere) that defines a sanctuary or limits who may refer to themselves as such. Other organizations caring for captive primates may be mislabeled as sanctuaries. This includes zoos, safaris, circuses, private owners, and exhibitors, all of whom have missions and purposes that are very different from that of sanctuaries. Zoos, the most reputable of which are accredited by organizations like the Association of Zoos and Aquariums or the European Association of Zoos and Aquaria, and smaller, unaccredited roadside operations have missions that include public education, entertainment, and conservation through the breeding of exotic animals. The missions of safaris and wildlife parks are very similar to that of zoos, and their activities can resemble other exhibitors of wildlife like circuses or performing animal acts. Private individuals who keep or breed monkeys or apes as pets do so in order to fulfill a lifelong fascination with wildlife, to have a permanent 'baby' for whom to care, or because they believe they can provide a good life for a captive primate (*My Child Is a Monkey*). The goals of these captive facilities are entirely opposite to what a true sanctuary aims to accomplish.

Reputable primate sanctuaries exist solely to provide enriched lifetime care to animals who have already served humankind and deserve a peaceful retirement (Schoene and Brend). They are non-profit organizations that are not open to the public and do not loan out, transport or exhibit their animals for any purpose (North American Primate Sanctuary Alliance). These practices ensure that the wellbeing of the animals is kept as the top priority and that animals are not considered a means to a profit. Although education through advocacy is integral to the operations of many sanctuaries, this is done through outreach and is not accomplished by hosting visitors. Being open to the public is frowned upon for a facility whose purpose is to protect the animals within its walls. The presence of human visitors increases stress and stereotypes and

decreases affiliative behaviors across primate species (Chamove et al.), indicating that it should be avoided for the sake of animal welfare.

Conservation of species, while a commendable and important goal, is not a focus of sanctuaries. Reputable sanctuaries have strict contraceptive practices and never intentionally breed their animals, as this would only perpetuate and exacerbate the problem of having high numbers of captive primates seeking sanctuary and a limited amount of resources to dedicate to their care. Unlike virtually every other industry, primate sanctuaries hope one day to be forced out of business. If their services are no longer needed, it means primates are no longer having their lives (and livelihood) controlled by human beings.

Because there is no law prohibiting an exploiter of animals from self-proclaiming itself a sanctuary, it is especially crucial that there be distinctions made between various types of facilities that care for captive primates. Accreditation and licensing is one way for the public to begin to recognize a reputable sanctuary from a faux-sanctuary (a facility who may claim to rescue animals but then also breeds, exhibits, sells or otherwise harms or exploits their animals) (North American Primate Sanctuary Alliance).

In the United States, basic licensing can be obtained from the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA). Although USDA licensees may still exhibit, exploit or manipulate primates for profit, if a facility attempts to obtain USDA licensure – the standards of which are minimal – and fails to do so, it may indicate problems with facility design and/or safety and should be a concern for animal welfare. A USDA license assures that the results of annual inspections will be made publicly available, a necessary though basic level of transparency.

Sanctuaries may be accredited by the Global Federation of Animal Sanctuaries, who perform inspections and documentation review to ensure that a sanctuary is sustainably managed and meeting certain levels of care for their animals. Inspections analyze enclosure size, enrichment plans, nutrition, medical care and other factors that can ensure a comfortable and safe life for captive animals.

A third indication of trust can be found if a sanctuary belongs to a coalition, such as the North American Primate Sanctuary Alliance or Pan African Sanctuary Alliance. These alliances

unite the primate sanctuary communities, provide support and education to their members, and help advance the causes that are important to all sanctuaries, including advocacy and serving as an expert voice promoting policy change.

Primate Sanctuary Futures

Shifts in public opinion that place increasing value on animal welfare, and the related legal changes that follow such empathetic movements, have resulted in primate sanctuaries being inundated with requests to house animals in the past decade. Since great apes are no longer actively used in laboratory research, the public has grown increasingly critical of research on monkeys. Monkey researchers are now approaching primate sanctuaries in record number. Additionally, there have been drops in the numbers of primates used for entertainment (Ragan) and the pet trade (Michigan State University).

Most North American primate sanctuaries are at capacity and have active waiting lists. In general, sanctuaries have land to expand but require funding to do so, as enclosures must be built in order to accept new residents (Fleury, 'The History'). As non-profit organizations, primate sanctuaries are completely dependent on foundation grants and private donations. In climates of financial unrest, the struggle to secure sufficient funding can be difficult and thus growth to accommodate more residents is not always within immediate reach. Primate retirements require time and forethought in order to be attainable and successful for all parties involved.

The long lifespan of primate species means that for every four-year-old macaque who outgrew his owners' interest or ability to house him, the sanctuary welcoming him is facing a probable twenty years (or more) of caring for him. The food, medical care, enrichment and staffing required to care for the lifetime of one retired primate may cost a sanctuary hundreds of thousands of dollars (Spraeztz). Primates who have spent years or even decades in captivity frequently develop maladies (including but not limited to heart disease, diabetes, and obesity from poor diets, or bone disease from lack of exercise) and neuroses (including self-injurious behaviors leading to amputation, obsessive compulsions, aggression, and depression) (Servick;


Assoc. of Zoos & Aquariums). Primate ‘pets’ are often subjected to total dental extraction, which severely limits their nutrition throughout their lifetime. Privately owned primates often develop species-inappropriate behaviors due to proximity with humans, rendering them unable to socialize with others of their own kind. The wearing of human clothes and diapers can cause skin ailments and permanent disfigurement. Primates retired from laboratory research may have complex medical histories and lifelong complications due to repetitive anesthesia, biopsies, or other practices common in scientific research such as solitary housing. This means that the animals being retired to sanctuaries may not be healthy or species-typical, and their care is not one-size-fits-all. Specialized veterinary care, enrichment protocol and housing situations must be tailored to fit the unique background and personality of each individual (Bradshaw et al.). This is more expensive than uniform care but is completely necessary to provide retired primates a chance for a healthy life.

Whereas previously primate sanctuaries bore the burden to convince owners to retire their animals, the tables have turned. Owners of primates are now the ones inquiring about placement, and sanctuaries are left having to balance the projected future needs of their facility with very needy individual primates who await placement. As land is available but funding for construction and care is the crucial factor when it comes to the feasibility of primate placement, sanctuaries now often require that funding come with each animal retired to their care. This ensures that sanctuaries do not become a perpetual dumping ground for ill-considered purchases from the pet trade or excessive breeding by trainers who face a dearth of performance gigs. Most importantly, requiring funding to follow retired primates ensures that sanctuaries are sustainable and will be available in years to come.

In the United States, most primates currently entering sanctuaries are arriving from laboratory research. This involves a number of species of great apes and monkeys. Hundreds of chimpanzees have left labs and headed to sanctuary in each year since 2013, a rate of retirement that is expected to continue (Taylor) until chimpanzee laboratories are completely empty. Although many hundreds of thousands of macaques are living in laboratories and small quantities have been retired, their mass exodus has not yet begun. It is recognized that the primate sanctuary community will need to prepare to take in large numbers of macaques in the coming

decades. The monkeys that *are* being retired from U.S. labs in recent years include larger groups of tamarins, capuchins and squirrel monkeys. The experience of Jungle Friends Primate Sanctuary in Gainesville, Florida (see table 1) is indicative of the spike in retirement of New World monkeys from labs: in 2015 alone, Jungle Friends welcomed 90 monkeys retired from laboratory research, a 1,400% increase from just two years prior (Jungle Friends, ‘Welcome Signs’).

*Table 2
Jungle Friends Primate Sanctuary Started Accepting
Monkeys from Research Labs in 2004
(Total of Pet and Lab Monkeys Per Year)*



Source: Courtesy of Jungle Friends Primate Sanctuary

In 2015 there were 105,584 nonhuman primates living in United States research facilities, only approximately 600 of whom were chimpanzees (U.S. Department of Agriculture). Certain monkey species continue to be intentionally bred or imported from overseas. However, the shifting of public opinion and negative publicity regarding the sufferings of research primates have affected the industry. This is clear when researchers seek sanctuary placement for their animals once studies have ended, when previously the animals would be recycled into other studies (often terminally) or euthanized. Although euthanasia is still occurring for a large number of unneeded research monkeys, sanctuary retirement of research monkeys is a growing trend (Buckmaster). Unfortunately, there are no pending legal changes in the country that indicate an end to monkey research, and without a clearly defined, federally-supported path to sanctuary, researchers may be confused about how to begin the process of sanctuary retirement for monkeys (Buckmaster).

There are related frustrations evident in countries that engage in primate research but have even fewer options for the retirement of laboratory monkeys. For example, in Australia macaques, baboons, and marmosets are bred by the hundreds (Humane Research Australia) to funnel into government-funded laboratory cages, yet there is a veil of secrecy regarding breeding center locations and the population size of research primates. It was estimated that over 710 nonhuman primates were used in research in 2009, although this was an incomplete survey and did not cover all locales (Cuthbertson). Despite a proclamation that '[o]pportunities to rehome animals should be considered wherever possible' (Australian Government National Health and Medical Research Council) in the Australian Code for the Care and Use of Animals for Scientific Purposes, there is no sanctuary system in the country to care for primates once they are no longer needed for research. As the breeding centers continue to churn out research subjects, numerous concerned animal welfare organizations support the creation of an Australian monkey sanctuary system, much like the United States' National Chimpanzee Sanctuary, Chimp Haven (Humane Research Australia; Marston; Animals Australia, Merkes).

In North America, the increase in demand has resulted in sanctuaries having to turn away research primates because there is not currently room to house them responsibly without sufficient funding. Researchers may not be aware that funding is required for sanctuary care, or

may not be able to fundraise sufficiently. Unsatisfied with this situation, the North American sanctuary community has worked on developing solutions that require collaboration between sanctuaries and laboratories and are feasible for both sides of the equation.

Proaction vs. Reaction

It is now recognized that sanctuary care is increasingly desired for captive primates who are used commercially. It is imperative that there be a reliable method of funding this basic need for primates' later years. Funding is provided for their basic needs while being bred, born, and living their early years serving various roles forced upon them by humans; primates are quite purposefully brought into being and treated as commodities in the pet trade, laboratory research and entertainment industries. The expenses related to their retirement must be recognized and planned for accordingly, as this is but another stage of primate life – albeit one that most often takes place in a different location and managed by a different organization.

Sanctuary care should not be regarded as a luxury; it has been proven to be more affordable than other forms of captivity. In 2012 daily care of a chimpanzee in a laboratory cost \$51 per day, while sanctuary care cost \$32 per day (HSUS). For a colony of 200 chimpanzees, sanctuary retirement translates into a daily savings of \$3,800 and \$1.4M annually. 2016 comparisons reveal similar savings for monkeys. The average of four different laboratory per diem costs for caged primates (including the NIH) reveal a mean cost of \$18.74 per day per animal (see table 2) whereas at the leading monkey sanctuary, Jungle Friends Primate Sanctuary, costs are \$5.52 per day (Bagnall, 'FW: TLC'). Sanctuary retirement for a group of 200 monkeys would save \$2,644 daily and \$965K annually.

Table 2: Comparison of Laboratory and Sanctuary Per Diem Costs, monkey

Facility	University of Pittsburgh	Boston University	National Institutes of Health	University of Kentucky	Jungle Friends Primate Sanctuary
Per Diem Cost	\$21.50	\$21.21	\$17.66	\$14.60	\$5.52

Sources: Kari Bagnall, Boston University Research Support; National Institutes of Health Office of Research Services; University of Kentucky Division of Laboratory Animal Resources; University of Pittsburgh Division of Laboratory Animal Resources

Lab research may be funded privately or through federal grants, but regardless of the source of initial funding, it is recommended that researchers build funding for retirement into project budgets before the research even begins (Fragaszy) instead of there being a mad dash to procure funding at the time a primate needs sanctuary. If, as is the case for most primates currently in labs, proactive financial planning was not accomplished and researchers find themselves seeking emergency placement for primates, there are other options to procure funding. Laboratories could sponsor a fundraising campaign, which may include alumni appeals if the lab is associated with a university (Fragaszy). The laboratory or university's public relations department may coordinate press releases with the sanctuary so as to optimize the event and bring about positive media attention to both facilities (Fragaszy). Some researchers even go so far as to use their own funds to ensure their research subjects receive a proper retirement. As primates are so much more than disposable equipment, their needs in retirement should be no less recognized nor valuable than their needs while under study.

It is important to note that sanctuaries keep the integrity of primate retirement as a main focus, thus concerns about collusions with laboratories (and a related opportunistic weakening of a sanctuary's ethical position regarding laboratory research) should be balanced with that of the welfare of an individual animal whose very life may be at stake. Part of sanctuary management involves coordinating placements with individuals from industries who may exploit

animals, yet this is a necessary and vital part of the retirement process. Without such cooperation, hundreds of primate retirements would never occur.

Zoos house many thousands of captive primates but do not traditionally retire their animals to sanctuary. However, there are other facilities where primates are kept captive for varying degrees of education and entertainment. This includes roadside (unaccredited) zoos, circuses, trainers for the film and television industries and small businesses based on primate entertainment such as monkey rodeos - all of whom earn profits at the expense of the animals in their care. Although sanctuaries receive requests from these types of facilities far less often than other forms of primate captivity, it should be recognized that as these entertainment-related industries close down, it is imperative that there be a way for them to provide funding for the lifetime care of the primates they bred or bought with visions of dollar signs obscuring their consideration of animal welfare.

The exotic pet trade, while perhaps not a concern in other countries, varies state-by-state in the United States and brings with it unique challenges regarding primate retirement. Owners of exotic animals claim to have unending love for their animals yet it turns out they very often do not have unending resources to provide proper care for their animals. People who purchase 'pet' primates can be easily misled by breeders seeking to make a quick sale, as the full extent of responsibilities of primate ownership (which are vast) may not be communicated adequately during the financial transaction (Fleury, 'So You Think'). It could be argued that it would be impossible to adequately convey how a typical household could provide proper care for a primate, since it is not feasible in the first place.

At the time of purchase, infant monkeys and apes are quite different from the strong, manipulative and aggressive adolescents and adults they grow to become, and so it can be assumed that sanctuary retirement is never truly considered until the moment it is needed. At that point, it is rare that a pet owner is able to commit to paying for the costs of sanctuary retirement, despite the fact that sanctuary retirement is cheaper than any other method of captivity (Humane Society of the U.S.; Jungle Friends, 'Research Retirement'). Due to insufficient breeder education to buyers, owners may not even be aware of how long a primate's lifespan may be, much less how expensive and difficult, if not impossible, it can be to meet the

physical, mental, social, nutritional and veterinary needs of a captive primate. As such, retirements of ‘pet’ primates tend to be more of an emergency situation than retirements from other industries and often occur when family members or law enforcement deliver ultimatums that animals must be surrendered, animals are confiscated, or when a human dies and leaves behind an animal that has nobody to care for him or her. Unexpected ‘pet’ retirements are harder to plan for, which is why so many sanctuaries have active advocacy campaigns that center on the harms of the exotic pet trade and work to enact stricter laws restricting and ending primate ownership.

Even with proper funding, there is a flow of information that is vital for a successful primate retirement to occur. If owners of primates cannot trust a facility or do not feel prepared for typical retirement procedures, they may feel overwhelmed and avoid retirement altogether, causing additional and unnecessary suffering to all involved. For retirements that are foreseen, it is recommended that owners contact sanctuaries well in advance of the intended placement. A two-year window is the recommended time frame to ensure that funding and all details may be secured for a pending retirement (Fragaszy). As indicated above, time is needed for the owners to select the proper sanctuary for their animal, for funds to be raised, and for the sanctuary to prepare for an incoming resident. It is imperative that trust in the sanctuary facility be established in order for the retirement process to be a smooth one.

When considering retirement at a specific sanctuary, primate owners should place emphasis on transparency, a good reputation and evidence of a high standard of care. It is important to have confidence in the organization’s long-term financial sustainability, as a sanctuary welcoming in animals but then closing down a few years later and needing to rehome its animals is really causing more of a problem than was ever solved. Indicators of a sanctuary’s financial state involve a review of its income tax form 990 (a publicly available document from all nonprofit organizations) for three to five years, a strategic plan for three to five years, financial statements like profit and loss sheets, balance sheets, cash flows, budgets and annual reports, and the sanctuary’s succession plan in the event of an untimely departure of its leadership (Bagnall, ‘Research Retirement’ 2015).

Some of the first conversations between an owner and a sanctuary will focus on the sanctuary's intake procedure and how the retirement will be funded, but there are many more conversations to be had before a retirement can successfully occur. Primate owners should visit the sanctuary ahead of time, if possible. The owner will want to ensure that the sanctuary has experience caring for the particular species of primate in question, and should take into account the habitat design and feeding, enrichment, and socialization practices in place. An important consideration should be regarding social housing, a crucial factor for primate mental health. If socialization will not take place immediately, a potential timeframe for release into living with conspecifics should be discussed (excepting cases where severe aggression and territoriality render a formerly solitarily-housed individual impossible to safely introduce to a group). Other sanctuary policies to examine include those related to chemical restraint (the use of medication to sedate an animal for transfer or medical procedures), disaster preparedness, escape and safe capture protocol, hospice and euthanasia, and sanctuary staffing. Depending on who is retiring the animal, the owner may be concerned with visiting rights. If the owner is a commercial user of primates, maintaining a reputation and ensuring the sanctuary will not run a smear campaign once the animal is within its doors may be of prime importance.

The sanctuary will also have many questions it needs to ask the primate owner during the planning of an animal's retirement. The animal's previous living conditions and his or her social history are integral to planning his or her future care. Any health issues and even personality quirks should be shared so that the transition to a new home and a healthy future may be within reach. Transportation of the animal to the sanctuary will have to be arranged and paid for, and it is recommended that the owner accompany the animal to the sanctuary site to provide assurance (Bagnall, 'Research Retirement' 2015).

Sanctuaries that appear to exploit their animals in any way should not be considered for primate retirement. Examples of red flags that indicate a sanctuary is untrustworthy include permitting public handling, photo opportunities, animal exhibitions or shows, breeding and commerce in animals (North American Primate Sanctuary Alliance). Exploitation of animals is a clear indication that welfare is not a priority at such a facility. Animals that are placed at such

facilities will not be retired, but will instead be put to work earning money for the facility through posing, performing and any number of unnatural and disruptive forced behaviors.

Some primate retirements occur with individual animals, but others may involve groups of primates. Although group retirements are more common with lab animals, this may also occur if a breeder or trainer decides to close down operations, or if a pet owner has more than one primate and can no longer care for them. Although some costs of caring for a retired primate rise exponentially with each individual (such as the cost of food), other costs, such as sanctuary staffing, utilities, enrichment, and construction of habitat may not rise with group size, as there are certain thresholds at which expenses can be shared by a group of primates without it costing the facility more money. Group retirement of primates should not necessarily be considered less feasible than solo retirements.

By far, the factor that has the most power to encourage or limit a primate retirement is funding. Primate sanctuaries exist solely to help needy primates, but if they are considered no more than a dumping ground for unwanted animals that have outlived their original ‘purpose’, the potential and future of sanctuaries is very limited. Sanctuaries cannot take in animals without requiring there be sufficient, reliable funding for the extensive needs of lifetime care included in the package. The onus is on the shoulders of primate owners to financially support their own animals in retirement.

Conclusion

Humans have bred primates for commercial use with clear intention. Whether the monkeys and apes live their early years in a laboratory cage, under bright lights on the stage, or strapped in a stroller, money is invested to keep captive primates alive and serving the functions for which they were purchased. When they can no longer fill these roles (or their owners tire of providing for them) their remaining decades of life deserve equal consideration and investment. Profits made at the expense of captive primates must follow primates into retirement.

Sanctuaries are not just an option, but the only option for ethical housing of captive primates. Retirement is more affordable and ethologically appropriate than any other form of

captivity because enriched sanctuary care ensures that primates' mental, physical, social, nutritional and medical needs are met. In retirement, the value of primates is once again inherently theirs, and is no longer colored by the services they may have once provided to benefit a species other than their own. Primates that served human needs must be granted the dignity of comprehensive care and freedom to perform species-appropriate behaviors before the release of death finally permits their liberation from captivity.

Works Cited

- Association of Zoos & Aquariums. *Personal Possession of Non-Human Primates*. 2015, www.aza.org/assets/2332/personal_possession_of_non-human_primates_7212015.pdf. Accessed 8 March 2017.
- Animals Australia. '7 Secrets About Primate Experiments in Australia'. <http://www.animalsaustralia.org/features/7-secrets-about-primate-experiments-in-australia.php>. Accessed 14 Sept. 2017.
- Australian Government National Health and Medical Research Council. *Australian Code for the Care and Use of Animals for Scientific Purposes 8th edition (2013)*. 2013, www.nhmrc.gov.au/_files_nhmrc/publications/attachments/ea28_code_care_use_animals_131209.pdf. Accessed 9 Aug. 2017.
- Bagnall, Kari. 'FW: TLC (Total Lifetime Care) spreadsheet for Jungle Friends'. Received by Erika Fleury, 15 July 2016.
- . 'Research Retirement - Bridging the Gap Between Research and Sanctuary'. American Society of Primatologists Meeting, 18 June 2015, Riverhouse on the Deschutes, Bend, OR. Also youtu.be/IhUjXoLyt5c. Accessed 6 March 2017.
- . 'Research Retirement: Bridging The Gap Between Research and Sanctuary'. North American Primate Sanctuary Alliance Workshop, 22 Sept. 2016, Hotel Murano, Tacoma, WA.
- Bain, CJ. 'Loving Them To Death'. *Jungle Friends Primate Sanctuary*, 2008, www.junglefriends.org/monkey-topics/understanding-the-issues/primate-sector.html. Accessed 9 March 2017.
- Blum, Deborah. *The Monkey Wars*. Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Boston University Research Support. 'Per Diem Housing Rates (Animal Rates)'. 2017, www.bu.edu/researchsupport/compliance/animal-care/housing/per-diem-housing-rates/. Accessed 8 March 2017.

- Bradshaw, G.A., et al. 'Building an Inner Sanctuary: Complex PTSD in Chimpanzees'. *Journal of Trauma & Dissociation*, vol. 9, no.1, 2008, www.releasechimps.org/resources/publication/building-an-inner-sanctuary. Accessed 8 March 2017.
- Buckmaster, Christine. 'Retiring Monkeys After Research'. North American Primate Sanctuary Alliance Workshop, 22 Sept. 2016, Hotel Murano, Tacoma, WA.
- Chamove, A.S., et al. 'Visitors Excite Primates in Zoos'. *Zoo Biology*, vol. 7, no. 4, 1988, doi: 10.1002/zoo.1430070407. Accessed 13 Feb. 2017.
- ChimpCare. 'Where Are Our Amazing Chimpanzees in the United States'. www.chimpcare.org/map. Accessed 8 March 2017.
- Conlee, Kathleen M., and Andrew N. Rowan. 'The Case for Phasing Out Experiments on Primates'. *The Hastings Center*, animalresearch.thehastingscenter.org/report/the-case-for-phasing-out-experiments-on-primates/. Accessed 13 Sept. 2017.
- Cuthbertson, Jacqueline. 'Primates in Research'. *Ban Primate Experiments*, www.banprimateexperiments.org.au/_literature_96049/Same_same_but_different_-_a_look_at_primate_research. Accessed 9 Aug. 2017.
- Fleury, Erika. 'The History of Primate Sanctuaries in the United States'. *YouTube*, uploaded by Erika Fleury, 22 July 2015, youtu.be/HAY1VUC5TMk.
- . 'So You Think You Want a Pet Monkey or Ape?'. *Primate Rescue Center*, 19 February 2014, www.primaterescue.org/the-center-blog/so-you-think-you-want-a-pet-monkey-or-ape. Accessed 20 March 2017.
- Fragaszy, Dorothy, et al. 'What Enables a University to Work Effectively with a Private Sanctuary to Retire Nonhuman Primates'. American Society of Primatologists Meeting, 18 June 2015, Riverhouse on the Deschutes, Bend, OR. Also youtu.be/mEoc_Evxeh4. Accessed 2 March 2017.
- Francione, Gary L. *Animals, Property and the Law*. Temple University Press, 2007.

- Grimm, David. 'World's Largest Chimpanzee Research Facility to Release its Chimps'. *Science*, 4 May 2016, doi:10.1126/science.aaf5696. Accessed 27 Feb. 2017.
- Humane Research Australia. 'Ban Primate Experiments'. 2015.
www.banprimateexperiments.org.au/ban-primate-experiments/index.htm. Accessed 9 August 2017.
- Humane Society of the United States. *Reducing the Deficit and Making Government Run Better: A New Way Forward*.
www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/legislation/reducing_the_deficit_and.pdf.
 Accessed 7 March 2017.
- Institute of Medicine and National Research Council. *Chimpanzees in Biomedical and Behavioral Research: Assessing the Necessity*. 2011, doi: 10.17226/13257. Accessed 20 March 2017.
- Jungle Friends Primate Sanctuary. 'How It All Began'. 2017,
www.junglefriends.org/about/history/how-it-all-began.html. Accessed 13 Sept. 2017.
- . *Research Retirement Challenge for UGA Monkeys*. n.d.,
www.junglefriends.org/assets/pdf/UGA_research_retirement_proposal.pdf. Accessed 8 March 2017.
- . 'Welcome Signs of Shifting Beliefs'. *Monkey Business*, 2016, p.6.
www.junglefriends.org/2016%20Monkey%20Business%20Newsletter%20web%203.pdf. Accessed 27 Feb. 2017.
- Michigan State University Animal Legal & Historical Center. 'Map of Exotic Pet Ownership Laws'. 2016, www.animallaw.info/content/map-private-exotic-pet-ownership-laws.
 Accessed 27 Feb. 2017.
- My Child is a Monkey*. Directed by Liz Friend. Zig Zag Productions, 2010.
[www.junglefriends.org/videos/monkeys-in-the-media/my-child-is-a-monkey-\(full-version\).html](http://www.junglefriends.org/videos/monkeys-in-the-media/my-child-is-a-monkey-(full-version).html). Accessed 15 Aug. 2017.
- National Institutes of Health. 'NIH Will No Longer Support Biomedical Research on Chimpanzees'. 18 Nov. 2015, www.nih.gov/about-nih/who-we-are/nih-

director/statements/nih-will-no-longer-support-biomedical-research-chimpanzees.
Accessed 23 Oct. 2016.

National Institutes of Health Office of Extramural Research. 'The Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee'. 2011, www.grants.nih.gov/grants/olaw/tutorial/iacuc.htm. Accessed 15 August 2017.

National Institutes of Health Office of Research Services. 'Division of Veterinary Resources FY16 Service and Supply Fund Rates'. 2015, www.ors.od.nih.gov/sr/dvr/documents/dvrrates.pdf. Accessed 8 March 2017.

North American Primate Sanctuary Alliance. *Position Statement: True Sanctuaries vs. Pseudo-Sanctuaries*. www.primatesanctuaries.org/issues/advocacy/true-sanctuaries-vs-pseudo-sanctuaries. Accessed 8 March 2017.

NSW Department of Primary Industries and Animal Research Review Panel. 'Animal Ethics Committees'. 2011, <http://www.animaethics.org.au/animal-ethics-committees>. Accessed 15 August 2017.

Peterson, Dale, and Jane Goodall. *Visions of Caliban: On Chimpanzees and People*. University of Georgia Press, 2000.

Primate Rescue Center. 'Frequently Asked Questions'. www.primaterescue.org/about-the-center/frequently-asked-questions/. Accessed 13 Sept. 2017.

Primate Rescue Center. 'The LEMSIP Chimps'. www.primaterescue.org/our-residents/rescue-stories/pozna-and-martina/. Accessed 9 March 2017.

Project R&R. 'The CHIMP Act'. 2017, www.releasechimps.org/laws/regulations/chimp-act. Accessed 13 Oct. 2016.

---. 'International Bans'. 2017, www.releasechimps.org/laws/international-bans. Accessed 27 Feb. 2017.

Prufer, Kay, et al. 'The Bonobo Genome Compared with the Chimpanzee and Human Genomes'. *Nature*, vol. 486, 28 June 2012. pp. 527-531. doi:10.1038/nature11128. Accessed 8 March 2017.

- Ragan, Patti. 'Looking Ahead'. North American Primate Sanctuary Alliance Workshop, 23 Sept. 2016, Hotel Murano, Tacoma, WA.
- Schoene, C.U.R., and S.A. Brend. 'Primate Sanctuaries – A Delicate Conservation Approach'. *South African Journal of Wildlife Research*, vol. 32, no.2, 2002. pp. 109-113.
- Servick, Kelly. 'Psychiatry Tries to Aid Traumatized Chimps in Captivity'. *Scientific American*, 2 April 2013, www.scientificamerican.com/article/psychiatry-comes-to-the-aid-of-captive-chimps-with-abnormal-behavior/. Accessed 15 Feb. 2017.
- Spraetz, Cathy Willis. 'Re: Cost for Care – Chimps'. Received by NAPSA Board Google Group listserv, 5 Dec. 2014.
- St. Fleur, Nicholas. 'N.I.H. to End Backing for Invasive Research on Chimps'. *New York Times*, 19 Nov. 2015, nyti.ms/2lMgkEG. Accessed 13 Feb. 2017.
- Taylor, Kathleen. 'Re: Stats'. Received by Erika Fleury, 9 Feb. 2017.
- United States Fish and Wildlife Service. 'U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Finalizes Rule Listing All Chimpanzees as Endangered Under the Endangered Species Act'. 12 June 2015, www.fws.gov/news/ShowNews.cfm?ID=E81DA137-BAF2-9619-3492A2972E9854D9. Accessed 9 Oct. 2016.
- United States Department of Agriculture, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service. *2015 Research Facility Annual Report*. 2016, www.aphis.usda.gov/animal_welfare/downloads/7023/Annual-Reports-FY2015.pdf. Accessed 9 Oct. 2016.
- University of Kentucky Division of Laboratory Animal Resources. 'Per Diem Rates and Other Services'. www.research.uky.edu/dlar/PerDiemandOtherServices.htm. Accessed 8 March 2017.
- University of Pittsburgh Division of Laboratory Animal Resources. *Animal Husbandry Per Diem Rate Schedule*. www.gensurgerylabs.pitt.edu/sites/default/files/FY16%20Husbandry%20Per%20Diem.pdf. Accessed 8 March 2017.

Varga, O. 'Critical Analysis of Assessment Studies of the Animal Ethics Review

Process'. *Animals: An Open Access Journal from MDPI*, vol. 5, no. 3 2013. pp. 907–922.

doi: 10.3390/ani3030907. Accessed 15 Aug. 2017.

Zimmer, Carl. 'Most Primate Species Threatened with Extinction, Scientists Find'. *New York*

Times. 18 Jan. 2017, [nyti.ms/2jAhIvh](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/18/science/primates-extinction.html). Accessed 9 March 2017.