

The ad came to the attention of company officials in early March after an article—bearing the headline “Bristol-Myers’ Third World Cancer Cure”—appeared in the *Multinational Monitor*, a periodical published by the Corporate Accountability Research Group in Washington.

The explanation given by the Bangladesh subsidiary was that some drug retailers had marked up drug prices to unconscionably high levels and that the purpose of the ad was to inform the public of the maximum price of “CeeNu” (a drug now being sold in Bangladesh for the first time) fixed by the government.

Parrott knows of no other instance of such an ad being published by a Bristol-Myers subsidiary. But he concedes that plans for promotional campaigns by overseas subsidiaries are not cleared by the New York office. Moreover, company policy manuals distributed to subsidiaries have not explicitly stated that ads for Bristol-Myers products shall not appear in newspapers or other publications of general circulation.

The Bangladesh embassy in Washington alerted the health ministry in Dacca to the ad after learning of it from the *Multinational Monitor*. Bristol-Myers has as yet heard nothing from Dacca about the incident.

Big Cuts for Land Fund, Pork Barrel Spared

Environmental leaders got some bad news the other day when briefed by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) on plans to balance the budget and reduce inflation.

They had been urging OMB to look hard at projects such as the Red River and Tennessee-Tombigbee waterways, which they regard as congressional pork. At the same time, they had urged that the Land and Water Conservation Fund for purchase of federal and state parkland not be cut.

What they learned from OMB was that Conservation Fund cuts had been made totaling nearly \$600 million, or well over half of all of the money in the fund for fiscal 1980 and 1981. But cuts made in the fiscal 1981 water projects budget of \$3.8 billion totaled only \$165 million.

OMB said that all cuts were worked out with congressional leaders. To the environmentalists, this told a lot; the congressional leadership, especially in the House, has resisted efforts at water policy reform.

Status of the Leopard

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is now proposing to remove the leopard of sub-Saharan Africa from “endangered” status and allow sports hunters to import leopard trophies into the United States. The proposal will be opposed by some but not all wildlife protection groups. How these groups view the proposal turns both on differences of philosophy about hunting and of perception about the practicalities of African wildlife management.

The Fish and Wildlife Service, which will not take final action on its proposal before the end of June, has concluded that leopard populations in all parts of sub-Saharan Africa except Somalia are large enough to justify reclassifying this species from endangered to “threatened.” This would mean that the leopard is no longer considered endangered in this part of its range but is not out of trouble because of factors such as habitat destruction, poaching, and poisoning by African ranchers alarmed at their killing of livestock. From reports by field researchers the Service puts the total leopard population of sub-Saharan Africa at anywhere from 230,000 to well over a million.

The reclassification would leave in place the ban on importation of leopard skins by furriers, which in the late 1960’s was running as high as 9000 skins a year. The rationale for allowing the importation of sports trophies, as requested by the Safari Club International, is that sports hunting can be strictly regulated and can bring jobs and income to people in the bush and thus give them an economic incentive to give the cats some protection and not destroy them indiscriminately as predators.

Two of the major wildlife protection groups, Defenders of Wildlife and the Fund for Animals, are opposed to sports hunting and see little or no economic advantage in it for the people of the bush. Simon Lyster, a staffer with

the Defenders, says “a live leopard can be of more economic value to a country than a dead one by virtue of the tourist trade it could encourage as well as its contribution to a healthy ecosystem.” Leopards are secretive and nocturnal, but are in fact sometimes seen by tourists who visit game parks.

Lewis Regenstein, executive vice president of the Fund for Animals, says, “The African rancher doesn’t understand why he should leave the stock-killing leopard alone so that some white hunter can shoot it and put it on his wall. It is a very elitist argument.”

The World Wildlife Fund, U.S.A., and the African Wildlife Leadership




Photo by B. F. Wolfe

Foundation are not opposed to hunting. While these organizations have not taken a position yet on the Service’s proposal, they seem likely to go along with it.

Russell E. Train, president of the Wildlife Fund, says that as one who has adamantly opposed the luxury trade in leopard skins for fur coats, he finds it awkward to draw a distinction in favor of importation of leopard trophies. But he does not think trophy hunting will endanger the leopard. Moreover, he does not feel comfortable second-guessing African officials who may wish to encourage such hunting in their countries; sports hunting is permitted, he points out, under the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species which he helped to negotiate.

On the other hand, Train agrees with Regenstein and Lyster that tourism and wildlife viewing and photographic safaris hold the greatest economic promise for the African countries.

Luther J. Carter