

Oryx

The International Journal of Conservation

The original paper was published in the *Journal of the Society for the Preservation of the Wild Fauna of the Empire* (1903-1925 and 1926-1950) or in *Oryx*, the journal of Fauna and Flora International (from 1951).

The website of the journal is (from 2008):

<http://www.oryxthejournal.org/>

The PDF is reproduced with permission from the CD version of The Centenary Archive 1903-2003, a fully searchable database of 100 years of the publications of Fauna and Flora International.

More information on: <http://www.fauna-flora.org/>

The Society was founded in 1903 as the Society for the Preservation of the Wild Fauna of the Empire, and subsequently named the Fauna and Flora Preservation Society. Fauna & Flora International is conserving the planet's threatened species and ecosystems – with the people and communities who depend on them.

Oryx - The International Journal of Conservation, is now published quarterly by Cambridge University Press on behalf of Fauna & Flora International. It is a leading scientific journal of biodiversity conservation, conservation policy and sustainable use, with a particular interest in material that has the potential to improve conservation management and practice.

The website, <http://www.oryxthejournal.org/>, plays a vital role in the journal's capacity-building work. Amongst the site's many attributes is a compendium of sources of free software for researchers and details of how to access Oryx at reduced rates or for free in developing countries. The website also includes extracts from Oryx issues 10, 25 and 50 years ago, and a gallery of research photographs that provide a fascinating insight into the places, species and people described in the journal.

The [Rhino Resource Center](#) posted this PDF in June 2009. We are grateful for the permission.

this in fact merely demonstrates the need for it, because not only is it desirable to preserve a wide variety of good genetic material of threatened forms for use in future investigations, but one day it might also be possible to use this material to reconstitute interesting lost organisms.

W. R. P. Bourne, Department of Zoology, Aberdeen University, Tillydrone Avenue, Aberdeen AB9 2TN, Scotland.

Lake Nakuru Black Rhinoceros Sanctuary

The letter on the Lake Nakuru Black Rhinoceros Sanctuary (*Oryx*, 26, 174–177) states, 'This sanctuary was always intended as a sanctuary for both black and white rhinos...'. Why? The white rhinoceros is not indigenous to Kenya, and those imported have been the southern subspecies, *Ceratotherium simum simum*, which is not endangered. There might be something to be said for Kenya trying to help conserve the seriously endangered northern subspecies, *Ceratotherium simum cottoni*, even though it too is not indigenous. But it seems misguided to expend what are no doubt limited resources on the southern form.

W. F. H. Ansell, Trendrine, Zennor, St Ives, Cornwall TR26 3BW, UK.

As the author of the article, Lake Nakuru Black Rhinoceros Sanctuary (*Oryx*, 24, 90–94), may I please be allowed to comment on some of the points raised by Mr R. T. Elliott in his letter (*Oryx*, 26, 174–175)? I write as a patron of the Rhino Rescue Charitable Appeal Trust since its inception in 1985, and as a trustee from 1986 to 1991.

1. Mr Elliott says that 'this sanctuary was always intended as a sanctuary for both black and white rhinos ... this point should have been mentioned'. This is not so. Rhino Rescue's brochure clearly states that the Trust was set up specifically to try to halt the decline in numbers of the black rhino, and does not mention the white rhino at all; the later introduction to Nakuru of a few of the latter was purely incidental.

2. Mr Elliott says that 'it was, indeed, due to excess numbers of both species that the Rhino Rescue started'. This, too, is incorrect. The Rhino Rescue Trust was, as stated above, formed solely to try to protect the diminishing population of black rhinos. The only place in Kenya where there was an excess of numbers was on the privately owned Solio ranch – an excess that the transference of animals from Solio to Nakuru helped to alleviate.

3. Mr Elliott says that 'Peter Jenkins and I decided to ... set up rhino sanctuaries elsewhere', implying that he had a hand in the formation of the Lake Nakuru sanctuary. He had no part in it whatsoever.

4. Mr Elliott claims that my statement that 'a further 11 females are due to be added to the park shortly' is 'pure speculation'. This was the figure given to Count Coreth, the founder of Rhino Rescue, by Dr Richard Leakey and Dr Rob Brett of the Kenya Wildlife Service.

5. Mr Elliott is correct in saying that the voltage aimed at for the electric fencing is 7000 and not 700 as stated; this was a misprint.

6. Mr Elliott says that rhinos introduced to Nakuru were released directly into the sanctuary, and that only injured animals were first acclimatized in the holding pens; in general this is correct.

7. Mr Elliott claims that my statement that 'the founding stock was deliberately kept low to encourage the animals to breed more freely' was 'never true for black rhinos'. I am afraid that Mr Elliott has clearly not read my article very carefully, or he would have realized that I was referring to the founding stock of black rhinos at Nakuru, and not to that at Solio where he was Warden.

Mr Elliott concludes by saying that I was 'given false information by other people and that (I) did not check my facts with those directly involved with the operations'. As my article made clear, it was written after a visit to Nakuru, where I was able to see the Rhino Rescue Trust operating at first hand, and after discussing at length the work of the Trust with Count Coreth and the Trust's Administrator in the sanctuary, Mr Jock Dawson.

Christopher Lever, Newell House, Winkfield, Berkshire SLA 4SE, UK.