

LIBRARY COPY

NEWSLETTER



INTERNATIONAL
PRIMATE
PROTECTION
LEAGUE

Vol. 12, No. 2

AUGUST 1985



Emperor Tamarin. Photo: Sy Oskeroff, Los Angeles Zoo Photo

**INSIDE: IPPL OPENS CAMPAIGN AGAINST
BOLIVIAN MONKEY TRAFFIC**

**A MEDICAL DOCTOR SPEAKS UP
FOR LABORATORY BABOONS**



THAILAND'S MALL OF MISERY

On 26 March 1985, the *Bangkok Post*, a Thai newspaper, carried a Letter to the Editor by a reader named James Jacobson. Jacobson described the atrocious conditions under which animals live at a shopping center menagerie at Patta Mall, a department store in Thonburi, Thailand. Thonburi is a town on the opposite side of the Chao Phya River from Bangkok, Thailand's capital.

Mr. Jacobson wrote:

On the top 2 floors of this mall, some heartless wretch has constructed a "zoo" – replete with every variety of animal – with the seeming objective of causing each animal the maximum amount of physical and mental anguish.

Jacobson described how Polar bears lay around in 90° heat (34° centigrade) and how macaws and other parrots were tormented by visitors. He was especially moved by the plight of the primates.

The most human of all – orang-utans and chimpanzees – look as defeated and miserable as, indeed, we ourselves would look if imprisoned in 2 x 2 x 2 meter cell blocks. Most alarming of all is King Kong, a six-foot gorilla, that simply lies deteriorating on a table, suffocated by lack of space.

A Thai member of IPPL visited the menagerie at our request and confirmed Mr. Jacobson's impressions.

To get into the zoo area of this department store, I had to pay 15 baht [75 cents U.S.]. I enclose the ticket which advertises King Kong. It took me quite a while to find King Kong. He is being shown among the children's clothing displayed for sale. On one side of the cage were children's amusement toys such as slides. The noise was terrific. On one side of his cage were seats for adults to sit and watch their children at play, and King Kong as well. He was curled under a table as far away as possible in a dark room. No water or food was seen in the cage, and, as it is situated on the third floor of the store, there is no sunlight. . . .

Ardith Eudey, former Co-Chairwoman of IPPL, also visited Patta Zoo and was appalled. She saw the gorilla keeper tormenting the animal by chasing him with a pot of water to get him moving.

One wonders, who would send a gorilla to suffer in such ghastly conditions, alone among humans? On learning that the gorilla had come from West Germany, IPPL immediately contacted West German wildlife authorities, who denied approving any such shipment. This denial was shown to be untrue by documents provided to IPPL by Thai wildlife authorities. The German CITES export permit was numbered I-W 00-030/83, and was issued to Jean Monti, Aachen Bird and Animal Park, Amtsvonnweg 58b, 4432, Gronau, West Germany, for 1 gorilla, originating in the Cameroun, to be shipped

BRITISH CRUELTY CONVICTION UPHELD

In January 1985, Britain's prestigious Royal College of Surgeons was tried and found guilty of cruelty to an experimental monkey. Charges involving four other monkeys trapped in the cage grids were dismissed, although they appeared to show gross neglect and caused two deaths. Cyril Rosen, IPPL's U.K. Representative, was a key witness for the prosecution in the first trial.

The College appealed and the case was reconsidered in June 1985. Cyril Rosen was again a lead witness in favor of monkeys' rights to decent treatment.

In spite of a massive defense efforts, the judge upheld the College's conviction, the first ever conviction of a British experimenter for cruelty to monkeys. .

All primates owe a debt of gratitude to IPPL's wonderful Cyril Rosen.

to Siam Farm Zoological, 1875/145 Soi Lertboon, Bangkok, Thailand. Siam Farm is a consortium of Thailand's disreputable animal dealers.

The veterinary certificate listed the shipper as the "Monti-Hahn Firm" of Aachen. The German city of Aachen is right on the German border with Belgium. When an infiltrator was able to penetrate the notorious Belgian smuggler Munro's compound in 1983, he was told by Munro that a gorilla for sale was being stored across the German border: this may well have been the same animal.

The Thai government issued an import permit to Siam Farm to bring in the unfortunate gorilla. Permit issuance made a flagrant mockery of CITES, because countries are not supposed to issue CITES permits for Appendix I species such as gorillas unless 1) they are legally acquired, 2) the recipient is adequately qualified to house them and 3) there is no commercial involvement. Nonetheless, the permit was issued by the "Law Enforcement Sub-Division" of Thailand's Royal Forestry Department. The gorilla was shipped to Thailand on Singapore Airlines on 21 February 1984.

The gorilla is not the only primate imported improperly to this commercial menagerie. A Pygmy chimpanzee suffers lonely incarceration. The origin of this animal is unknown, but it is likely he was smuggled out of Zaire via Belgium to Thailand. However, a Pygmy chimpanzee was stolen from Antwerp Zoo in 1983, and the current whereabouts of this animal is unknown. One can also question the origin of the orang-utans, chimpanzees, and wide range of endangered monkeys at the Patta Zoo.

Our Thai member noted such rare birds as Hyacinth macaws and commented:

I think South America has arrived in Thailand! The birds are in pairs as I believe that to get these birds, it was declared that they were acquired for "captive breeding."

The stress and noise, heat and abnormal surroundings will soon take their toll and more will be imported.

The Patta Menagerie must be closed down. Thailand must stop allowing importation of supposedly protected wildlife to this vile place, and enforce the provisions of the Convention on International Trade in endangered species.

If you agree, please make your feelings known by writing letters to:

His Majesty King Bhumibol of Thailand
Chitralada Palace, Rama VI Road
Bangkok, Thailand

and:

The Director-General
Royal Forestry Department
Phaholyothin Road, Bangkok, Thailand
Overseas air mail now costs 44 cents (U.S.) per half-ounce.

BOLIVIA TO RE-ENTER MONKEY TRADE

Wildlife conservationists world-wide were delighted when Bolivia implemented a one-year ban on all fauna exports on 1 May 1985. The ban was scheduled to last one year. Prior to that time, Bolivia had been a major exporter of monkeys, birds, reptiles, and reptile skins. Thousands of monkeys left Bolivia each year. Some of these monkeys had been caught in Bolivia: others were caught in Bolivia's neighbor countries, where they were legally protected, and shipped to Bolivia for onward transportation on "Bolivian" export documents. Brazil, with its large number of endangered primate species, had been badly hurt by "The Bolivian Connection." Several shipments of golden-lion tamarins (which do not occur in Bolivia but are restricted solely to Southeastern Brazil), had turned up via Bolivia in Belgium, France, and Japan.

Opposition to the Bolivian ban came from many quarters:

1) Bolivian animal exporters (grouped together in the Association of Fauna Exporters of Santa Cruz), who had made huge profits plundering their country's natural resources, and couldn't wait to start again,

2) Smugglers from neighboring countries which ban fauna exports, who had lost their "laundering center" for poached wildlife,

3) Wildlife importers in Western countries, including the United States, since no other South American country allowed massive wildlife exports like Bolivia did.

Bolivia's massive trading in wildlife and wildlife products is a principal concern of the Secretariat of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES). CITES is an international treaty to which over 80 countries belong. The Secretariat's concern was expressed in its Report to the Conference of the treaty party nations, which was held in Buenos Aires, Argentina, from 22 April-3 May 1985. (Dr. Shirley McGreal represented IPPL at this conference).

In its "Report on International Compliance Control," the Secretariat stated:

Huge quantities of CITES specimens continue to be "exported" from Bolivia. Most of these specimens have been taken illegally in other countries and the great majority are traded in contravention of the Convention . . . Forged documents are common, stolen permits are used . . . genuine permits cover shipments of illegally acquired or traded specimens. The scale of the illegal trade is vast, involving tens of thousands of specimens.

Noting that the Bolivian Government was un-cooperative, and even seemed to be "strongly promoting" the illegal wildlife traffic, the Secretariat concluded:

The situation with respect to Bolivia is extreme and the Secretariat believes that only an extreme solution will be effective.

The Secretariat's concern was clearly justified: during the course of the conference a Bolivian conservationist sent a cable noting that nine members of the Santa Cruz Association of Animal Exporters had already filed applications to export over 10,000 primates and 300,000 birds pending the anticipated lifting of the official export ban on 1 May 1985. Primates for which permits were requested included squirrel monkeys, Capuchin monkeys, owl monkeys, howler monkeys, and three species of tamarins.

A tough resolution calling on countries to ban with immediate effect all wildlife shipments from Bolivia was "watered down," being replaced with a milder resolution calling on Bolivia to establish within 90 days procedures to regularize its wildlife trade, failing which sanctions could be established later. The Secretariat was concerned at the watering-down of the resolution, feeling that only total import bans would provide incentive for Bolivia to start complying with CITES provisions.

Over 20 conservation-oriented non-governmental organizations signed on to a group letter drafted by Shirley McGreal of IPPL, calling on Bolivia to maintain its total legal ban on wildlife exports. Among the signers were Greenpeace, the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, The Animal Protection Institute, the Animal Welfare Institute, and the National Audubon Society. In a response dated 3 May 1985, Alberto Kattan of the Bolivian delegation stated that the wildlife trade constituted "an important source of income" for the country and "an irreplaceable means of subsistence for some of its most famished and poverty-stricken citizens." This statement ignores the fact that it is the big exporters who make the big profits off the slave trade in wildlife: local hunters usually get just a few cents or dollars for every animal or bird they provide to the exporters. Further, one could use the same argument to justify the cocaine trade, child prostitution, or any other profitable illicit activity.

Although it looks like Bolivia will re-open the legal wildlife trade, causing death and suffering to thousands of its wild animals and birds, IPPL believes that letters from wildlife activists world-wide calling for continuation of the ban on export of wildlife could be helpful. Please, therefore, send your comments to:

President Hernan Siles Zuazo
Palacio de Gobierno
Plaza Murillo
La Paz, Bolivia

His Excellency the Ambassador of Bolivia
3014 Massachusetts Av. N.W.
Washington D.C. 20008
United States.

Overseas air mail costs 44 cents (U.S.) per half-ounce.

MONKEYS GO INTO SPACE

When the U.S. National Aeronautics and Space Administration asked for applications for candidates to be the "first teacher in space," thousands of enthusiastic teachers applied for the position.

The fact that so many people were more than willing to go did not prevent NASA from sending two **unconsenting** squirrel monkeys and 24 rats into space on the Challenger space shuttle on 29 April 1985. The animals were carried in order to test the "high tech cages" planned for use in future animal experiments in space.

The monkeys were known as 384-90 and 3165. According to Mission Scientist William Thornton, the monkeys were not given names because scientists do not want to "humanise" their experimental animals. One of the monkeys reportedly bit one of his trainer's fingers to the bone, and the other bit Dr. Thornton's

stethoscope during a physical examination.

Robert Overmyer, Mission Commander, stated of the monkeys: "They are vicious and there is nothing lovable about them!"

Commenting in the *New York Times* (13 May 1985), IPPL member and PETA activist Loretta Hirsh stated:

In this situation, what really needs "humanising" are the humans – and Colonel Overmyer's comment is an excellent illustration of the observation that humankind's definition of a vicious animal is one that defends itself when attacked.

The monkeys returned safely to Earth – and even had their revenge on Dr. Thornton, who was assaulted by floating monkey and rat feces when entering the space laboratory from the Challenger's main cabin!

MORARJI DESAI SPEAKS ON EXPORT BAN

In November 1977, Shri Morarji Desai, at that time Prime Minister of India, banned export of monkeys after publicity in the Indian media about mistreatment of monkeys by the U.S. military. The use of Indian monkeys in shockingly cruel radiation experiments had been uncovered by the International Primate Protection League and denounced in IPPL press releases to the Indian media after efforts to stop the experiments at the U.S. end had ended in failure.

At the time, Desai stated that the ban was imposed on humanitarian grounds. However, since that time, IPPL has seen repeated claims that the ban was imposed on "conservation grounds." The most recent version of this claim appeared in an article by Charles Southwick that appeared in *Natural History* (February 1985). In the article, entitled "Rhesus Monkey's Fall from Grace," it was asserted that the ban was brought about because of India's concern about "dwindling numbers" of Rhesus monkeys.

Concerned at what we felt to be a distortion of the facts surrounding the ban, Dr. Shirley McGreal, Chairwoman of IPPL, tracked Morarji Desai down to get at the truth. Desai, now a spry

nonagenarian, responded with a personal hand-written letter dated 16 April 1985, in which he stated:

I received your letter of 3rd inst. yesterday evening.

You are quite correct in saying that I banned the export of monkeys on a humanitarian basis and not because the population was lessening. I also banned frogs being exported for their legs.

I believe in preventing cruelty to all living beings in any form. This is the ancient Indian culture and is a part of vegetarianism.

What is said in the enclosed article ["History of Indian Monkey Export Ban Re-written," IPPL Newsletter, April 1985] is correct and Dr. Southwick is completely wrong in his view, which perhaps is deliberate.

IPPL has drawn this letter to the attention of Dr. Southwick, who, in a response dated 29 May 1985, stated that, "I now realize from Mr. Desai's letter that the International Primate Protection League played the really key role in getting the ban declared in the first place," and that the ban indeed reflected Indian concern over "cruel and inhumane uses of primates."

ZOO-LAB LINKS

A conference on "Primates: the Road to Self-sustaining Populations" was held at the luxurious Vacation Village, San Diego, from 24-28 June 1985. The conference was sponsored by the San Diego Zoological Society and the Morris Animal Foundation of Englewood, Colorado.

The conference organizer was Kurt Benirschke, M.D., Director of Research at the San Diego Zoo, who was (and may still be) associated with experimental extremist lobbies and has served (and may still serve) on U.S. National Institutes of Health Animal Resources Committees. Dr. Benirschke selected the conference speakers, choosing an assortment of primate field workers, zoo officials, and primate experimenters.

The presence of so many experimenters, many associated with the U.S. Primate Centers, on the program, caused concern to officials of IPPL, PETA, and San Diego animal welfare organizations. Notably missing on the program was any discussion of the ethics of breeding primates or any speaker from an animal protection organization. When asked by IPPL about this accidental or deliberate omission, Benirschke commented that, "The ethical issues are the topic of the banquet speaker!" [Exclamation mark added, Benirschke made this comment seriously.]

Among the experimenters scheduled to speak were Dr. Stephen Suomi, a specialist in causing insanity and depression in baby monkeys, Dr. Michael Keeling, who has a contract to use chimpanzees in AIDS experiments, and Dr. Dennis Johnsen, who killed four baby gibbons in experiments into a dog disease (heartworms).

Animal activists are growing increasingly concerned over growing links between laboratories and zoos. Many U.S. zoos attempt to dispose of surplus primates by offering them for sale in the **Primate Supply Information Clearinghouse**, a weekly publication funded by the National Institutes of Health which has as its stated purpose, "to provide a communication mechanism for sharing laboratory primates among research institutions in the United States."

Among zoos that have used the **Clearinghouse** to dispose of surplus primates are: San Diego, Fort Worth, Los Angeles, Dallas, San Antonio, Bronx, Seattle, Santa Barbara, Utica, Salt Lake City, Phoenix, Oakland, and Toledo. Primates from other zoos may reach laboratories through dealers and brokers. Some zoos are even known to have shipped primates to fatal experiments, including Detroit Zoo which sent its entire colony of over 30 Crab-eating macaques to their deaths at Washington University, St. Louis, in 1982, and whose Director, Steve Graham, is proud of what he did.

Members of PETA, IPPL, and several other organizations held demonstrations against "Zoo-Lab Links" at the Vacation Village, where 3 protestors were arrested, and at the San Diego Zoo. The protests received wide media coverage and focused public attention on the issue of "Zoo-Lab Links." The protestors contended that primates in laboratories serve as slaves of humans ("research tools"), and that zoos should exist to serve and protect animals. Thus zoos should take steps to prevent births of unwanted primates.

ALIKA LINDBERGH BATTLES PET DEALERS

Alika Lindbergh, IPPL's Representative in France, has launched a campaign against the "oiselleries" (pet shops) along the banks of the River Seine in Paris. Alika regularly finds South American monkeys on sale there as pets. The animals are kept in atrocious conditions. Alika was particularly moved by the plight of a moribund baby spider monkey, suffering from rickets and weakness. The animal was offered for sale at U.S. \$2,000.

Alika has complained unsuccessfully to French authorities about the situation. Her complaints to the Veterinary Service of the City of Paris were met with the response that the monkey appeared quite "normal."

Alika plans to continue her battle until the last "oisellerie" is closed down.

NECESSARY FUSS

by Dallas Pratt, M.D.

Dallas Pratt is a distinguished medical doctor and humanitarian, and a long-time friend of the International Primate Protection League. His comments on the head injury experiments at the University of Pennsylvania prove clearly that not all scientists support painful and cruel experiments on live animals. We strongly urge our hundreds of foreign readers to study this article carefully, and we hope that those living in primate habitat countries, will support existing export bans or work to get bans established. Primates deserve protection – whether they are rare or common – prized or viewed as pests.

On 28 and 29 November 1984, in New York, two different audiences were shown a 25-minute videotape entitled *Unnecessary Fuss*. The film was excerpted from 60 hours of taped research records removed on 28 May 1984, in a raid on the University of Pennsylvania's Experimental Head Injury Laboratory. The "Animal Liberation Front," the identity of whose members is unknown, claimed responsibility for the action. They also took 46 pages of laboratory notes.

HOW INJURIES ARE PRODUCED

This Head Injury Laboratory has been running a research project for over ten years in which brain injuries are inflicted on monkeys – formerly rhesus, but now baboons. A pneumatic cylinder is coupled to a helmet cemented to the animal's head by dental stone, and creates the brain injury by a violent acceleration-deceleration wrench. The project is directed by Dr. Thomas Langfitt, a neurosurgeon, and Dr. Thomas Gennarelli, chief investigator, and is primarily supported by one of the National Institutes of Health – to the tune of about one million dollars a year.

THE VIDEOTAPES

The "liberated" material, recording the activities of this laboratory, was turned over to PETA (People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals). PETA made the 25-minute videotape and titled it "Unnecessary Fuss," ironically recalling a phrase used by Dr. Thomas Gennarelli to deprecate the uproar over the exposure of the laboratory. [Details of how you can obtain a videotape of the head injury laboratory appear after this article].

The "fuss," however, provoked demonstrations on the University campus, received extensive coverage in Philadelphia and Washington newspapers, aroused supporters of the humane movement throughout the United States, and extended to Britain where the videotape was seen on the British Broadcasting Corporation. Even members of the University of Pennsylvania faculty protested, notably a group of thirteen law professors, with Professor Gary L. Francione in the lead, who wrote Sheldon Hackney, University President, that they found the film "deeply disturbing not only because of the basic moral and legal issues that are raised, but also because there is some question as to whether the research conforms to accepted norms of scientific procedure."

AUDIENCE REACTIONS

The two New York audiences, numbering ninety-five in all,



Dr. Dallas Pratt

were a miscellaneous group interested in animals. The majority were connected with humane organizations; others were zoo workers, teachers, writers, veterinarians, film makers, lawyers and interested friends.

The film presentations they attended were under the sponsorship of an animal welfare organization and have been held biannually for the past twelve years. Usually eight films relating to animals, with a humane "angle," are shown, and the viewers write a brief critical appraisal of each one. Most of those present had, over the years, seen much filmed animal suffering and abuse (trapping films, commercial animal fights, painful laboratory experiments, etc.), but for many, *Unnecessary Fuss*, judging by their written comments, was one of the most shocking films they had ever seen. Here are some of the milder excerpts from their critiques:

I am speechless. The researchers made all their own points against this sort of research, though I'm certain they didn't mean to. . .

The cavalier attitude of the workers is shocking . . . an insult to science and humanity.

I was embarrassed for the people in this film. They were not human, let alone humane.

I've seen autopsies conducted with more dignity and respect.

EXPERIMENTERS LAUGH AT INJURED MONKEYS

The lack of dignity and respect which offended many of the viewers was illustrated by the joking in which some of the experimenters indulged at the expense of the animals who, by their miserably dilapidated appearance, were clearly suffering from the after-effects of their brain injury. Consider the attitude of a "scientist" who manipulates the arms and legs of such an animal while a narrator chortles:

That's him waving! As you can see, the monkey is awake, moving all his extremities. That's his trainer who taught him to do all these tricks.

Another wreck of a baboon, trapped in a chair, is introduced with the words:

Cheerleading over in the corner we have B-10. As you see, B-10 is still alive. He's wishing his [about to be brain-damaged] counter-part well and hoping for a good result. [The way the experimenters injure one animal while another animal is watching from a restraint chair appears the ultimate in perverse or thoughtless cruelty to IPPL – in that it is **totally** unnecessary. Baboons are intelligent, perceptive animals, one can only imagine their terror].

PAIN IGNORED

Clowning with injured and helpless animals has no place in a serious laboratory. But even more disgraceful is a failure adequately to recognize when an experimental animal is suffering pain. At one point, several experimenters are performing surgery on a baboon's head. The animal keeps jerking, sometimes violently, obviously in pain. One of the operators shouts at him to "Stop moving!" Another voice says, "We better get some nitrous [anesthetic]". Another says, "It hurts him for Christ's sake!" – but the operation proceeds without nitrous oxide being administered.

Even worse than this is when the experimenters ignore the existence of the animals' pain, either in a scientific report or in a public denial when challenged. There are several illustrations of this in the pages which follow.

For example, one episode which horrified many who saw the videotape was the removal, after the head injury, of the metal helmet which had previously been cemented to the animal's head with dental stone. Workers armed with a hammer and chisel delivered repeated blows to the dental stone and helmet to separate them from the scalp, (up to 160 blows per animal).

The baboon, obviously neither in a coma nor anesthetized, kept wincing under the blows. Since the animal had recently suffered head and brain damage, the pain of hammer blows rained on his head could have been excruciating.

THE PENN HELMET

In the 1981 *Grant Application* of the Head Injury Laboratory to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, the helmet, known as Penn II, is said to have been perfected in October 1980. Connected with it is the piston which violently thrusts the cemented-in head in such a way that, depending on the speed and direction, it is able to produce any degree of brain injury, from mild concussion to severe brain "shearing." Dr. Gennarelli specifically makes the point in a statement printed in the University of Pennsylvania publication *Almanac* (9 October 1984) that the conditions in his laboratory:

have been developed to avoid any objects striking the head. There is no hammer-like effect . . . rather, the head is moved rapidly in a very precise manner and amount so that acceleration and deceleration forces are applied without impact.

In a paper Gennarelli and five other researchers wrote in 1982 ("Diffuse Axonal Injury and Traumatic Coma in the Primate," *Annals of Neurology*, 12 Dec. 1982, 564), describing injuries inflicted on 45 primates wearing the Penn II helmet, it is emphasized again that the effects of acceleration were studied "without the compounding effects of an impact." Yet we read in the same paragraph, "dental stone rigidly coupled the animal's head into the metal helmet." We have seen that this could only be removed by hammering.

Aside from the pain this crude assault on the already damaged head must have caused, it would surely introduce unwanted traumatic physiological effects. The experimenters simply ignore this in their scientific reports. Taxed with these omissions, Dr. Gennarelli writes in the 1984 *Almanac*:

Early in the experiments, the skin would stick to the plaster-of-Paris and had to be separated from it by chip-

ping the plaster-of-Paris away with a hammer and chisel. While this procedure caused no harm to the animal, new methods have been developed in the past year to prevent the head sticking to the plaster-of-Paris.

Since Penn II was perfected in October 1980, and since a tape of February 1984 shows a recently traumatized baboon still being mistreated in this way, Dr. Gennarelli is admitting that animals' heads have in fact been hammered for at least three years. It is impossible to imagine that this procedure causes "no harm" to animals whose brains have been injured only minutes before — especially when the substance to which the skin sticks is **not** plaster-of-Paris, but the much harder dental stone.

Three months later Dr. Gennarelli has changed his story. He and Dr. Langfitt participated in a "Dialogue" on Jan. 1985 at the University, attended by a group of professors and reporters from campus publications. *Almanac* (February 1985) published the proceedings. Pressed by Professor Francione to explain the matter of the hammering (which by this time must have become a major embarrassment to the research defenders) Dr. Gennarelli still admits that there was a problem of the monkeys' skin sticking, but blandly contradicts his previous *Almanac* statement and maintains that:

What you see as hammering is loosening the junction between the helmet and the dental stone, not between the dental stone and the head.

He concludes that there is no reason "that it should cause injury, because of the type of acceleration that this type of hammer blow, **away from the head**, would cause to the brain."

Away from the head? when head and helmet are cemented together? This makes no more sense than the other completely contradictory statements.

"In some experiments," Dr. Gennarelli continues, "it is necessary to keep animals alive for several hours or days. These animals are cared for in exactly the manner as our human head-injured patients."

How many human patients have their heads hammered post-injury?

Furthermore, if one were to accept this equal treatment claim as literally true, it would mean that human patients of these doctors might never receive any drugs to relieve their pain after head injuries, because nowhere has there been found in the published papers from this laboratory, nor in their grant application, nor in the videotapes, any reference to their animal "patients" receiving such drugs.

REPEAT INJURIES TO SOME BABOONS

Dr. Gennarelli's statement about keeping some of the animals alive for "several hours or days" is another half-truth. The *Grant Application* states on p. 176 that:

A sub-set of animals destined for survival longer than several days will be trained in memory and behavior tasks prior to injury.

Laboratory notes reveal that some animals are kept in varying states of pain and disability for several months, during which time they are repeatedly injured. Baboon B-47 was injured on five different occasions: 28 July 1983; 30 September 1983; 3 February 1984; and **twice** on 4 April 1984. B-47 was killed approximately one month later. It is likely that the laboratory has been inflicting multiple injuries on monkeys for years. Monkey A was injured in 1975 five times in July and twice in August; Monkey B twice in August and once in September. Both primates were kept alive, but in a condition which hardly bears thinking of, until Nov. 19, 1975.

When Dr. Gennarelli was questioned about these cases, he dismissed Monkeys A and B on the grounds that he hadn't yet joined the laboratory in 1975, and Monkey B-47 because that case was under the control of another (absent) investigator and "it would be more appropriate for him to answer the question." But he did go on to describe the two circumstances in which animals received multiple injuries. One was when there was a failure of the apparatus to deliver the proper dose of trauma, and it had to be repeated. The



other involved animals with "minor" injury who were being subjected to behavioral and learning studies: "in no instance have we ever given a second injury to those whose first injury was already severe."

The laboratory notes on Baboon B-47 read:

B-47 was a trained animal whose injury was a little too severe for him to be testable. Woke up first day post-injury, unable to sit up, more or less remained in this state over the next month.

As the investigator noted, this was certainly more than a "minor" injury.

Who was this unnamed investigator, one would like to know, who was inflicting multiple injuries on B-47? There is very good reason and precedent to be concerned about successive mutilating operations performed on animals, followed by "behavioral and learning studies." From 1960 to 1977 a long series of mutilating operations on the brains of cats followed by behavioral studies were performed at the American Museum of Natural History by Drs. Aronson and Cooper. The nature of these experiments aroused so much public outrage that the project was terminated.

TAUB TRIAL

Another scandal followed the 1980 exposure by Alex Pacheco of practices in the Institute for Behavioral Research, at Silver Springs, Maryland, also research supported by the National Institutes of Health. There the mutilations were inflicted on monkeys whose limbs were rendered useless by the cutting of afferent nerves which transmit sensation to the brain. The traumatized monkeys, in various stages of chronic debility, were subjected to behavioral studies, sometimes involving electric shock, over long periods. The chief investigator, Edward Taub, was convicted of cruelty, not because of the surgical mutilations, but because the care of these badly damaged animals was found to be criminally inadequate.

The Maryland Court of Appeals later overturned Taub's conviction on the technicality that the Maryland anti-cruelty statute did not apply to research under a Federal grant.

In making these comparisons, I am not suggesting that practices in the Head Injury Laboratory could be prosecuted under an anti-cruelty statute. Comparable, however, is the suffering which occurs in animals who have been 1) traumatized or surgically mutilated; 2) then kept alive for a considerable time and 3) subjected to behavioral tests, physical or physiological manipulations, and repeated trauma or surgery – all of which are likely to cause distress to the already debilitated animal.

WHY TRAUMA EXPERIMENTS ARE FUNDED

This type of experiment has recognizable earmarks. The damage to the animals is great and potentially shocking to the public, but to counteract this the experiment is said to be of exceptional benefit to humans. It is funded as a contribution to "basic science," meaning that no immediate therapeutic benefit is expected – but new knowledge is promised which will eventually generate therapeutic applications. The animal is damaged by physical means (surgery, radiation, electricity, acceleration-deceleration, etc.) which is claimed to be extremely precise. A large paraphernalia of monitoring and testing devices is employed.

A recurrent characteristic of these experiments is the frequent denial by the operators that their mutilations cause pain. In the Taub case, when the members of the Animal Care Committee of Taub's Institute were questioned by the inspection committee of the National Institutes of Health on the use of analgesics, they stated that:

Post-operative pain-killers were unnecessary in surgical de-afferentation, and the monkeys undergoing the operation rarely had any feeling in or around the affected limb immediately following surgery

Perhaps not "immediately," but eventually post-deafferentation pain occurs, caused by nerve growths (neuromas) at the cut end of the fibres, or by the hypersensitive nerve cells released from the inhibition they formerly received from the severed nerves. Deaf-



ferented animals often bite the affected paws, and several of Taub's monkeys chewed off their fingers.

But Dr. David Rioch, a member of the Animal Care Committee, even had an answer for that, saying that:

Applying human expectations of pain to animal surgery is inappropriate because pain is primarily a matter of societal conditioning to which animals are not subject.

GENNARELLI'S DEFENSE

Dr. Gennarelli took a similar line, intimating that brain-injured animals don't suffer from post-operative pain by analogy with human patients who, "recovering from severe brain injury do not complain of pain." This statement, made during the "Dialogue" in Jan. 1985 when he was being pressed by Professor Francione on the use of pain-relieving drugs in his laboratory, or rather their non-use, is hardly credible. The acceleration-deceleration movement applied to the baboons' heads is similar to the "whiplash" which, in car smashes, causes characteristic injuries. There is tearing of ligaments supporting the vertebrae which produces muscular spasm so intense that the slightest movement of the head can cause excruciating pain. Brain injury itself, if there are contusions, internal bleeding and nerve damage, can result in almost unbearable headaches. Textbooks of neurosurgery regularly refer to symptoms of headache, dizziness and vertigo following brain injury. As to bleeding, indicating damage to blood vessels, the experimenters deny that this occurred when the Penn II helmet was used, but the laboratory notes show that this was both significant and common.

Some of these injuries may well have been caused by the hammering already referred to. Dr. Jay Glass, a scientist engaged for fifteen years in brain research, comments on this in a September 1984 statement:

Anyone who has ever worked on the brain and is familiar with the delicate vasculature connecting the dura mater to the brain, must shudder at the damage done to the brain from these very forceful and repeated blows to the skull.

In the "Dialogue," Professor Francione asked Dr. Gennarelli whether "the use of the hammer and chisel" was revealed in any of his published papers. No, replied the doctor, "and it wouldn't ever be revealed because it's not germane to the results of the experiment." He adds that there was no pathological or physiological evidence of damage as a result of the hammering. But how could he be sure that all the pathology in a post-mortem specimen was caused by the planned trauma and none by the "up to 160 per animal" hammer blows?



His answer, however, is predictable, because the results of this type of experiment **have** to conform to the experimenter's hypothesis, i.e., that all the pathology found in the brain is created by the controlled and measured thrust of the Penn II helmet and attached mechanism. As for the deviations or variables which might interfere with the "perfect fit," they are discarded as "not germane." The animals are merely things, "tools of research," without individuality, or feelings, or the right, either in behavior or physiological response, to deviate from the role in which the investigator has cast them.

They are even denied the right to **feel** pain, according to Dr. Rioch, or experience fear – "That's B-10, cheerleading in the corner" – because these too are irregularities which would introduce unwelcome zigs and zags in the expected behavior profile. Thus on the videotape we see a baboon thrashing wildly around on the operating table. He has to be tied down with tapes. Dr. Gennarelli shrugs off this and other episodes with the comment:

In our clinical judgment the animals were not feeling pain. They were clearly moving. That was one of the intentions because we wanted an agent that would allow us to perform a neurological examination but still enable the animal to be pain-free.

The agent used was Sernalyn, a drug which produces a feeling of dissociation from the environment (popularly known as "angel dust" – definitely not a pain-killer). The struggling baboon, possibly in pain, certainly terrified, seemed only too conscious of the threatening environment, but his violent reaction was dismissed: it was incompatible with the docility expected of him after sedation with Sernalyn.

SELF-PERPETUATING PROJECTS

A disturbing feature of experiments of this type is their interminable character. A healthy, intact animal is damaged in a manner which produces a loss of function. The nature of the loss is defined by physiological and behavioral tests. A paper is written. The investigation continues with damage now inflicted in another area, producing a different loss of function. These experiments may be very simplistic, but it is claimed that if many are performed (naturally at the expense of numerous animals), each with some variation, with the usual panoply of technology, statistical analysis and monitoring to a fare-thee-well, a result will emerge comparable in complexity with some aspect of the human condition. Reduced to its bare bones, this is the program of the Head Injury Laboratory.

Yet Gennarelli himself has said:

Patients, from a scientific point of view, become injured in a very messy fashion. That is, they have circumstances that compound their injuries, multiple in-

juries, and the specific circumstances that cause their injuries are never to be known.

Faced with this variable-laden reality, the laboratory of the animal experimenter which seeks in its archaic way to assemble the human image by taking animals apart, often fails.

This is rarely admitted: Gennarelli's writings and statements insist that the twisting of the monkey's head "can produce prolonged coma . . . its effects duplicate the entire spectrum of traumatic unconsciousness described in human beings." While it is conceivable that the forces applied in the laboratory to the monkey's head **may** produce a specific form of diffuse brain injury, with a minimum of other damage, how can this be equated with the "messy" multiple human injuries, so familiar from car accidents? Here is the unbridgeable gap which constantly reappears in animal-based experimentation attempting to replicate the human condition.

LABORATORY VARIABLES

Furthermore, there are just as many variables present in the laboratory situation to scramble the results and widen the gap as there are in the circumstances of a "real world" accident. They can be overlooked by the investigator, or suppressed in the report, but they often retard or frustrate the success of the experiment. One of the "troubles" is that the experimental subjects are not in test tubes but in cages. Since they are living beings, there are individual differences: sex, age, state of nutrition, aggressiveness, weight. For example, the laboratory protocol called for baboons weighing not less than 8 kilograms: "because our studies require the monitoring of so many variables that it is impossible to do so in smaller animals." Yet the laboratory notes reveal that at least ten animals weighing less than 8 kg. were used.

Visualize a human infant of 4 months, of about the size and weight of these small monkeys, having its body penetrated by tubes into the heart, arteries and veins, electroencephalogram bolts cut into the skull, another bolt inserted in the skull and attached to a tube brought out through a "stab wound" in the neck, a catheter introduced into the bladder, a thermometer into the rectum, and an airway into the trachea. Although anesthetized during the surgery necessary to insert this apparatus, the animals are bound to have suffered from the continual irritation of these implants which remained in place during the post-operative days or weeks.

But perhaps it was a kind of blessing for the smallest ones – they may have died sooner.

Death must be counted as another variable in these experiments. When animals are so seriously injured that they can neither eat, drink or walk, they require constant attention. Such animals are vulnerable to carelessness, ignorance or absence of attendants. If death does not occur, then debility of the animal through infection or neglect (as happened to many of the Taub monkeys) may introduce irregularities in the desired results.

Added to these are actual species differences. Baboons are currently being used in the Head Injury Laboratory (possibly because they are comparatively cheap) but the baboon's elongated snout and non-spherical skull are not characteristic of the human head.

Above all is the factor already mentioned: the degradation of animal-as-end into animal-as-means (means to **our** ends), into a "tool of research." This transformation of the animal into a "thing" distances him/her still further from the human whom "it" is supposed to serve as model. At the same time, the investigator is tempted to manipulate the animal-as-tool to prove a thesis. What doesn't fit is discarded, or smothered in data. The manipulations may be impressive, may even attract grants, but the living spark which the animal might impart is extinguished. The gap reappears, and the human application fails again.

WHY ANIMAL EXPERIMENTATION FLOURISHES

With so many hazards to success in animal experimentation, why does it seem to flourish? Largely, I believe, because it is the traditional occupation of an entrenched group, the present day representatives of generations of experimenters, supported by a network of specialist organizations, laboratory suppliers and their

political lobbies, commercial (especially pharmaceutical) research opportunities, government grants dispensed under the buddy system euphemistically called "peer groups," journals open to their writings, and the willingness of the public to "let them try it out on the dog."

What are the pros and cons of letting the holocaust of primates at the University of Pennsylvania's Head Injury Laboratory continue? Through 1984 over 200 monkeys have been killed in these experiments. The 1981 *Grant Application* asked for the use of 250 through 1987. The applicants added, "We would prefer larger numbers of animals in many categories." Of the 200, Dr. Gennarelli said that 35 were "chronic" animals, that is, were kept alive for varying lengths of time, some more than a month. He claims that his laboratory's ability to produce a severe form of diffuse brain injury with prolonged coma in animal subjects is most important. He predicts that knowledge coming from such experiments will lead – some day – to new forms of treatment.

Of course this is a statement made by every animal experimenter seeking support for a project. For those, like Gennarelli's group, engaged in "basic research," it is a no-lose proposition. If a contribution to a new treatment is made, fine; if not, also fine: "much knowledge has been gained but more research is needed."

Another 250 baboons, please.

WASTE OF BABOON LIVES

Those opposed to this tragic wastage of baboons doubt that research of high quality can be produced in a laboratory where experimenters – at least those seen on the videotape – are clownish and slipshod, where they smoke as they operate, and fail to maintain any kind of surgical asepsis. The claim that an effective treatment may emerge years hence, after an indefinite period of trying to put together a jigsaw of animal fragments, weighs very lightly in the estimation of these critics against the heavy and ever-growing burden of sacrificed animals.

ALTERNATIVES TO INJURING ANIMALS

What are the alternatives? In this case, a determined effort by the University of Pennsylvania to step-up head injury research on human subjects. Some of this is already under way (see Appendix 2 of the 1981 *Grant Application*) with the cooperation of the Hospital of the University, the School of Medicine, and the School of Engineering and Applied Science.

The method of study starts with computer-based mathematical models which predict the response of the human brain to various modes of impact. These predictions can be verified by physical models of the brain and its components (blood vessels, nerves, etc.), made from surrogate material such as gelatin. To quote the

Grant Application, "Measurements that are impossible to make from animals, such as displacement of brain elements, can be made in these models."

Human cadaver material has been used in the past in impact experiments (although it was stopped for a while by an officious Congressman), and diffuse axonal injury could no doubt be demonstrated in acceleration-deceleration experiments performed immediately post-mortem.

Study of accident victims, and living brains, can now be very much more revealing through the use of CT (computerized tomography) scans, which allow for longitudinal as well as cross-sectional studies; also through PET (positron emission tomography) scans.

Even more important may be the use of NMR (nuclear magnetic resonance). This involves no hazardous radiation, and produces images of soft tissues without the interposition of bone shadows. NMR can also perform biochemical analysis and give information about complex metabolic interactions within the brain.

Finally there should be a renewed emphasis on autopsy study of the brains of accident victims – to overcome what has been called a too-relaxed attitude of neuropathologists in this important area.

EPILOGUE

In November 1983 I visited Roger and Deborah Fouts at Central Washington University and had a look at their remarkable research project. The contrast between the appearance – and activities – of their group of five chimpanzees (including the famous Washoe), who communicate via the sign language of the deaf, and that of the baboons of the Head Injury Laboratory, is the difference between heaven and hell.

Fouts has defined his scientific philosophy thus:

The welfare of the animals comes first, then the research. The idea is to continually enrich their lives – and at the same time achieve benefits for humans . . . I believe that in science we can learn more by enriching animals than by destroying them. The people at Loma Linda justify the use of the animal heart [the "Baby Fae" baboon-human transplant] on the basis of biological continuity, yet they justify destroying the baboon on the basis of discontinuity. This is scientific schizophrenia.

This is the split – the gap – which we have found in the Head Injury Laboratory. Judging by their exaggerated statements defending the laboratory, the looniness seems to have spread to the apologists in the University administration. I prescribe a dose of the Fouts philosophy as excellent therapy for the investigators in the laboratory, for the University administrators and, last but not least, for the powers-that-be in the National Institutes of Health who have so persistently supported this destructive research.

HOW YOU CAN OBTAIN HEAD INJURY VIDEOTAPE

Copies of the videotape of the Head Injury Laboratory at the University of Pennsylvania are available from PETA, P.O. Box 42516, Washington D.C. 20015.

The cost of a 1/2 inch VHS videotape is \$35.00 and the cost of a 3/4 inch tape is \$45.00.

Videotapes are available for free rental with a \$45.00 deposit.

ABBY AND ANN AT ODDS

Abigail Van Buren and Ann Landers, famous sisters who write advice columns for American newspapers, are in disagreement on the subject of animal experimentation. Ann Landers regularly publishes statements in support of experimentation, while Abby speaks out strongly against it.

When asked her opinion of animal experimentation, by a reader, Abby responded with a quotation from George Bernard

Shaw:

You do not settle whether an experiment is justified or not by merely showing that it is of some use. The distinction is not between useful and useless experiments, but between barbarous and civilized behavior. Vivisection is a social evil because, if it advances human knowledge, it does so at the expense of human character.

SUB-STANDARD CONDITIONS AT PENN LABS

The University of Pennsylvania Animal Laboratories were inspected on 5 June 1984 by an inspector from the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The Department is charged with inspecting registered research facilities.

The inspection revealed gross deficiencies at the laboratories, which houses primates used in Dr. Gennarelli's head injury experiments.

No less than 74 deficiencies were noted by the inspector. Extracts from his comments follow:

Facility in general was in very poor condition. Walls, ceiling and floor shall be freed of cracks, peeling paint, holes, imperfect junctures. . .

[Food and bedding] shall be kept in a dry cool area, stored off the floor and away from the walls and only keep enough on hand to keep rotated and bug and contamination free. . .

Ventilation appears to be very poor. . .

The primate cages do not meet space requirements. . .

Cages and room need 100% better sanitation in all rooms. The walls and floors need a good scrubbing down as there is a buildup of urine and debris on walls and floors of all rooms. Dead roaches and equipment . . . stored in refrigerator. Mouse droppings and litter all around. . .

Cockroaches everywhere you look, mice and vermin droppings observed. Better job of cleaning and pest con-

trol is badly needed.

The report was critical of Facility Veterinarian Dr. Moshe Shalev.

Animal husbandry practises are so poor that we recommend more and better caretakers, and another veterinarian to assist Dr. Shalev, **as soon as possible**.

The inspector asked University of Pennsylvania authorities to send a letter of intent to correct these deficiencies to Dr. Ronald Yoxheimer, the Area Veterinarian-in-charge for the Department of Agriculture, within one week. Animal activists from the Philadelphia area met Dr. Yoxheimer on 5 March 1985. He said he had received the letter of intent, but that conditions were still being corrected. He added that the roaches had been so bad on a June 6, 1984 follow-up visit that the inspector personally removed some animals to safer rooms.

In this context, IPPL finds it shocking that the Reagan administration is seeking a total cut-off of funds for enforcement of the Animal Welfare Act. It is a disgrace that a reputed university is keeping helpless animals incarcerated in such abominable conditions.

Suggestion: If you have any animal laboratories in your community, please consider submitting a Freedom of Information Act request for copies of inspection reports over the last 3 years to the Freedom of Information Act Officer, Department of Agriculture, Room 771A, 6505 Belcrest Road, Hyattsville, Maryland 20782. Send copies of any reports you obtain to Headquarters, especially if there are any violations.

IPPL CHAIRWOMAN ADDRESSES STUDENTS

Shirley McGreal, Chairwoman of the International Primate Protection League, addressed 85 South Carolina high school students attending the Governor's School in Charleston, South Carolina. The theme of the presentation, which took place on 3 July 1985, was "International Action to Protect Wildlife."

The Governor's School is held annually and attended by many of the brightest young people in the state's high schools.

Dr. McGreal's presentation featured an introduction to primates and their problems and a discussion of how IPPL has handled

past problem situations, such as primate smuggling, misuse of monkeys by the U.S. military, and deaths of primates in shipment.

As the final "problem situation," the planned lifting of the Bolivian ban on export of wildlife was presented and the young people were asked for suggestions as to what action could be taken. The students had plenty of good ideas. We hope that the session will sensitize at least some of the young people present to the problems of the world's beleaguered wildlife, and that they will see that concerned citizens really do have power to make changes.

PRIMATE QUESTIONS IN TWO PARLIAMENTS

The Parliamentary Procedures of both India and Great Britain permit Members of Parliament to submit formal questions to Government Ministers for response. Recently, questions about primates were asked in both these Parliaments.

The first question was asked by Shri Satya Pal Malik, a member of India's Rajya Sabha. (Malik's wife, Dr. Iqbal Malik, wrote the wonderful article about "The Monkeys of Tughlaquabad" that appeared in the December 1984 IPPL Newsletter.)

Shri Malik's question, presented on 2 May 1985, was:

Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government proposes to continue providing legal protection to the monkeys of India: and

(b) whether Government also proposes to continue the existing ban on export of Rhesus monkeys and other primate species?

On behalf of Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi, Minister of the En-

vironment Shri Vir Sen answered "Yes" to both questions.

On 13 May 1985, Mr. Greg Knight, M.P. for Derby North, Great Britain, asked:

What species of great ape are or have been used for the purpose of experimentation in the United Kingdom at any time during the past three years: and for what purpose?

Mr. David Mellor, Secretary of State for the Home Office, replied:

The information collected centrally does not distinguish between types of primate. I understand, however, that no species of great ape — defined as a chimpanzee, gorilla, or an orang-utan, is currently in use. . .

IPPL members living in India or Great Britain may wish to ask their M.P.s to submit questions on primate problems to their governments.

ANIMAL LIBERATION FRONT RESCUES MONKEY

The infant stumptail monkey whose picture you see (before and after "liberation") was born at the University of California at Riverside. He was just one of 260 animals removed from the campus in a pre-dawn raid on 20 April 1985. Other animals rescued included cats, pigeons, rats, deer mice, and opossums.

The raid was carried out by members of the underground Animal Liberation Front. The infant monkey, who was just 5 weeks old, was given the name "Britches" by his rescuers. "Britches" was being kept in isolation with his entire skull and most of his face covered by surgical tape and electrical gadgets as part of the protocol for a study of the combined effects of sight deprivation and isolation. It is surprising that anybody would consider such experiments necessary as hundreds, if not thousands, of primates have been blinded and/or isolated in the name of science already.



"Before"

According to a report of the raid carried by United Press International (21 April 1985), the raiders filmed and photographed the animals before they were freed. They also removed lab notes showing that some infant monkeys had been killed in the isolation-blinding experiments.

Ted Hullar, Executive Vice-Chancellor of the University of California, was quoted as saying that, "We have reason to believe that they [the animals] are in worse hands [than at the university]."

IPPL invites members to look carefully at the two photographs and drop us a postcard telling us whether they agree that "Britches" is in "worse hands" now than he was before.

According to the *Los Angeles Times* (23 April 1985) a veterinarian has removed the stitches and contraptions and restored the baby monkey's sight.



"After"

GIBBON-KILLER NAMED HEAD OF PRIMATE CENTERS PROGRAM

Dr. Dennis Johnsen, a veterinarian, was recently appointed to the position of Head of the Primate Research Centers Program at the U.S. National Institutes of Health. His duties include supervision of the seven Regional Primate Centers, which, between them, hold over 10,000 primates' lives in their hands.

Dr. Johnsen holds the dubious distinction of being a winner of the "Award" for questionable research that IPPL used to award in early *Newsletters*. In October 1975, he received the "Award" for an experiment he conducted while with the U.S. Army's SEATO Laboratory in Thailand. This laboratory used to hold over 100 gibbons, even though gibbons were, in theory, "Totally Protected Animals" under Thai law, due to their endangered status and the brutal manner in which gibbons come into captivity (slaughter of mothers to get infants).

In the experiment in question, Johnsen and a group of colleagues inoculated four female three-year old gibbons with **dog heartworms** to see what would happen, killing the little gibbons off at varying intervals. The conclusion was that, "The response of the gibbon to *dirofilaria immitis* [dog heartworms] is similar to that of the dog," and that, "Gibbons appear to be the animal of choice for studying heartworm infection in a primate host."

In spite of their protected status under Thai law, the U.S. Army used gibbons in studies of diseases such as cholera, dengue fever, and malaria. Gibbons were housed in tiny cages 4' x 2' by 4', (1.2m. x .6m. x 1.2m.), a cruel imposition on an acrobatic species such as the gibbon.

After IPPL-generated adverse publicity in the *Bangkok Post*, and a raid on the facility by Thai wildlife authorities, the gibbon colony was disbanded in 1976.

Other winners of the IPPL "Award" for questionable research were Dr. Michael Trollope for car-crashing of 85 primates in a cannon impactor, (November 1974), Gershon Berkson for a series of experiments involving blinding baby monkeys, (April 1975), Harry Harlow and associates for a piece of "deprivation research" that involved placing baby monkeys with a surrogate "mother" whose temperature would change from near-freezing to near-burning, with severe consequences including death for the baby monkeys, (May 1975), and Edward Taub for nerve-severing experiments on baby monkeys, causing them severe suffering, (March 1976). Taub was, of course, later convicted of cruelty to research monkeys.

PROBOSCIS MONKEY PROJECT FOR SABAH

Although Proboscis monkeys generally do badly in captivity, suffering high mortality, three U.S. zoos (Bronx, San Diego, and Los Angeles), are sponsoring a captive breeding program for the

species in Sabah, East Malaysia. The animals would be removed from the wild and caged at the orang-utan Rehabilitation Project in Sepilok, Sabah.

CHIMP LAB PROPOSED FOR SOUTH AFRICA

The Johannesburg *Sunday Star* (17 March 1985) told how the newly-established Roo-de-plaat Laboratory near Pretoria, South Africa, planned to set up an "embryo transplant" program for mass production of baby chimpanzees for experiments.

Embryos would be removed from female chimpanzees and placed in baboons' wombs for continued development. The chimpanzee would supposedly soon start cycling again, and produce a new embryo. Thus, one female chimpanzee might produce several babies per year, thus making available large numbers of experimental chimpanzees.

The article noted that Facility Veterinarian Duan Goosen also had plans to experiment on baboons and vervet monkeys. He told the *Star* that around 1,000 chimpanzees per year are captured annually in the Transvaal for South African research facilities, noting that these animals might well otherwise be killed as "agricultural pests."

IPPL Adviser Dr. Colin Groves of the Australian National University, Canberra, Australia, strongly opposes plans for "super-ovulation" production of baby chimpanzees. His comments follow. We'd like yours.

The use of animals in medical research has been standard practice since the days of Sir William Harvey. The general public takes it for granted; but if pressed many people, perhaps thinking about it in concrete terms for the first time, would express some sympathy for the laboratory animals and some hope that they are not too badly treated.

There are two directions from which the practice of animal use should be examined. First, we should ask what research, exactly, is being conducted; is it the sort that can justify the discomfort or pain of the experimental animals? Opinions differ as to the degree to which much of the research is medically necessary; but there would be no dispute that some definitely is, some equally definitely is not. The area of uncertainty in between is the area which, presumably, is open for discussion; but in the meantime the public should not be fooled into thinking that we are talking of some activity that is inevitably 'for the good of humanity'.

The other direction is to ask 'what species, and by what methods?'. The two questions could, under some systems of ethics and under some systems of animal husbandry, be closely intertwined. Put succinctly, it is possible to be much crueller to a primate than to a mouse. Pain is pain, but because of differences in intelligence it is possible to conceive of conditions of housing and confinement and kinds of experimentation that would be of extreme cruelty to a primate while they would not be to a mouse. Primates, in the main, are creatures of complex sociability. To cage them under conditions making it impossible to indulge in proper social interactions is, bluntly, cruel. To perform brain experiments, or inject them with infective agents, which have the effect of reducing their social or intellectual functioning is similarly cruel.

When considering chimpanzees the remarks made about primates in general have redoubled force. What we



Chimpanzee: Photo: Templer

now know of the intellectual functions of chimpanzees – their self-awareness, their complex abstract reasoning powers, their cognitive skills in general – makes it plain that we must plan how we treat them with the greatest sensitivity, because almost anything that we force them into will be in some sense cruel. Zoos today often take quite extraordinary measures to provide their chimpanzees with interest, comfort, space, and opportunities for full self-expression; most zoo directors are fully conscious of how frighteningly close to ourselves are chimpanzees and other apes – in mind as well as in physique.

To read in the South African Sunday Star (March 17th, 1985) of a plan to breed chimpanzees in a kind of production line for laboratory use is to have one's mind drawn back into a nineteenth-century dark age, when the poor were placed in workhouses, the mentally ill were chained up in bedlams to be laughed at, and apes were confined to insanitary iron prisons. Dr. Goosen puts a very concerned conservationist face onto his proposals: chimpanzees are endangered, so we'll breed them specially in baboon surrogate wombs. Not a word of the ethics of it, however. Is this because of ignorance? It may be; those working in biomedical research are often woefully ignorant of their subjects as anything but collections of livers, nerves and other organs. But some are aware, and simply ignore the fact, because it is inconvenient. Others become aware, and honourably think again: it is reported that Christian Barnard and Carleton Gajdusek are two such, and I would like to think it is true.

Shooting baboons as pests in the Transvaal, sad though it is in one way, is quite a different matter from using our next-of-kin as experimental 'things'. I hope Dr. Goosen's project is stopped. There is room for doubt about the conservation aspect of the plan, but the ethical aspect is in no doubt: it is repugnant.

FRENCH MONKEY FOREST DRAWS PRAISE

Cyril Rosen, IPPL's British Representative, visited La Forêt des Singes in May 1985. The Monkey Forest is located at Rocamadour, France, and is operated by IPPL member Gilbert de Turkheim.

Mr. Rosen reports:

It is a marvellous environment for the monkeys.

There are approximately 200 monkeys, including 45 babies, running free in more than 25 acres of forest. The entire area is enclosed by an 8 ft. high electrified fence, which the monkeys learn to avoid.

The Monkey Forest provides visitors with excellent educational material about the Barbary macaque, the sole species exhibited there.

SINGAPORE ZOO: DEATH TRAP FOR GORILLAS?

In spite of the 1983-84 deaths of four imported gorillas, Singapore Zoo is still trying to acquire gorillas to help "save" the species from extinction!

The International Primate Protection League and individual conservationists feel that gorillas need protection FROM not BY Singapore Zoo!

Leading the opposition to the zoo's acquisition of further gorillas are IPPL staff and Dr. Robert Cooper, Veterinarian at the Primate Center in Franceville, Gabon.

To explain the deaths of the four gorillas and justify efforts to acquire more, the zoo circulated a statement to all the major zoos of the world. The statement blamed the deaths on **Pseudomonas pseudomallei**, a common ground pathogen in Southeast Asia.

The arguments presented to justify further importations included:

1) a vaccine is available to prevent infection in gorillas. This justification appears spurious to IPPL, for reasons to be presented later in this article.

2) the imported gorillas, which had been provided by the Bristol Zoo in England and Prince Rainier's animal collection in Monaco, had been raised "in relative isolation and sterility." Therefore, they lacked "resistance to common organisms."

3) the zoo had, after the deaths of the gorillas, placed chimpanzees on the island. Since the chimps did not die, this constituted "proof" of the zoo's "theory" that lack of immunity caused the four gorillas' deaths.

As part of its effort to acquire gorillas, Singapore Zoo made plans to send Zoo Veterinarian Roy Sirimanne to Africa to attempt to locate animals. One of the people contacted by Zoo Director Bernard Harrison in regard to gorilla procurements was Robert Cooper, who works with gorillas at the Franceville primate facility, where the first gorilla born in captivity in Africa lives. Harrison had previously contacted Cooper about obtaining gorillas in 1984, after two of the four gorillas the zoo had obtained in late 1983 were already dead – a fact Harrison omitted to bring to Cooper's attention.

In a written response to a telephone-call from Singapore Zoo officials on 25 January 1985, Cooper stated:

Your lack of candor regarding the life-threatening risk of **P. pseudomallei** infection to any gorillas acquired by the Singapore Zoo could be logically construed as placing a greater value on zoo attendance (and income) than on the survival and future of those gorillas obtained to attract zoo visitors. Your assertion that gorillas acquired directly from Africa would have more resistance to **P. pseudomallei** than those coming from zoos elsewhere is **absolutely undemonstrated, highly unlikely, and transparently self-serving** [Emphasis added].

Cooper noted that Gabon extends full legal protection to gorillas and that "exportation documents are impossible to obtain." He warned that:

Any attempt to circumvent this enlightened policy will be internationally publicised and exposed here at the highest level.

Later, Cooper cabled to tell zoo authorities that "Dr. Sirimanne's visit is unwelcomed here and his purposes in Africa absolutely opposed."

Harrison responded to Cooper's cable with a letter dated 17 April 1985. He stated that, "Only wild-caught animals that cannot be rehabilitated can be imported into Singapore." Since there is no gorilla rehabilitation scheme, this means that any wild-caught gorilla coming into captivity would be accepted by the zoo, leading to the possibility of "made-to-order" orphans, which is just what almost every gorilla exported by animal dealers from Africa has been. Ignoring Cooper's statement that Sirimanne would not be welcome in Gabon, Harrison insisted that:

Dr. Sirimanne will certainly be in Libreville [capital of Gabon] and, besides meeting with the wildlife au-

thorities in Gabon, may find time to visit Franceville, where he will try to meet with you.

Dr. Cooper was so outraged by Harrison's letter that he prepared and circulated widely a detailed rebuttal. This statement was dated 8 May 1985. Cooper took issue with Harrison's statement that the zoo would import solely "wild-caught animals that cannot be rehabilitated" by noting that the statement could be used to justify exportation of almost any protected animals, and:

If carried to its logical extreme, would constitute a complete regression to the pre-CITES era of virtually unrestrained trade in endangered species.

Cooper also noted the CITES requirement that any animal exported under CITES must be legally obtained, and stated, in regard to gorillas, that:

Any specimen which finds its way into captivity has invariably been orphaned by the illegal killing of its mother.

Since Harrison had said that Singapore (a long-time hold-out) intended to join CITES soon, Cooper also emphasised importation conditions mandatory on CITES members. One condition is that, "the import permit will be for purposes which are not detrimental to the survival of the species." Cooper stated that:

Exportation from Africa of the extremely valuable products of **illegal** gorilla hunting can be nothing but detrimental to the survival of this species in nature . . . Wild populations must be protected completely from the pressures generated by the extreme value of gorillas to zoos as high revenue-generating exhibitions.

CITES also mandates that, "the proposed recipient of a living specimen is suitably equipped to house and care for it." Cooper stated that the deaths within months of four imported gorillas from **Pseudomonas** infection "should preclude any responsible Scientific Authority from certifying that this condition has been met (and perhaps it never can be)."

In addition, CITES does not permit importation of endangered species if the specimen is to be used for "primarily commercial purposes." Cooper quotes from the Singapore Zoo's pamphlet *The Gorilla Experience* to show the zoo's commercial motivations:

The Singapore Zoo has a pressing need to provide a new attraction to the Zoo so as to maintain public support for a very worthwhile cause.

The gorilla exhibit is to be our prime crowd-puller for 1984 . . . once the gorilla exhibit is opened, further publicity [was] required. A paid advertising strategy was worked out with an advertising agency to maximise exposure to the public. A variety of souvenirs were manufactured so that a "gorilla cult" could be developed with our youngsters.

It is clear that, while talking "conservation," Singapore Zoo is planning to "cash in" on any gorillas it acquires (as do other zoos world-wide).

Cooper's comments were reported in the Singapore *Sunday Times* (2 June 1985). Zoo Director Harrison responded by reiterating his claim that, "Since the death of the gorillas, a vaccine for the virus (**sic**) which killed them had been developed," and that the zoo would not deal directly with "[gorilla]-trappers" but obtain only gorillas "which cannot readjust to life in the wild." Harrison also made the claim that:

In Gabon, some restaurants sell gorilla steaks – shrunken gorilla heads are sold as souvenirs."

Harrison failed to identify locations at which such incidents have occurred, or explain how this, even if true, would justify the zoo's activities.

In view of the zoo's repeated claims that a newly-developed vaccine would protect further gorillas it acquired, IPPL located the developer of the vaccine, who turned out to be Neylan Vedros,

Ph.D., Professor of Immunology at the University of California at Berkeley. Vedros reported that he had developed a vaccine to prevent *pseudomonas* infection in cetaceans which was in use to protect dolphins living in a Hong Kong aquarium from the pathogen. However, in response to IPPL's specific question, "Will you please provide IPPL with details of this vaccine and whether you feel confident that it will ensure that future gorillas acquired by the Singapore Zoo will not die?" Vedros replied, "I have had no experience with the disease in primates and therefore cannot answer the question." IPPL contends that the zoo's extrapolation from dolphins to gorillas constitutes self-serving misuse of science.

The latest news is that Dr. Sirimanne's trip to Africa was scheduled to take place in July, and that it would include visits to Cameroun, Zaire, and Gabon, all gorilla habitat countries.

It is our hope that this will be an unsuccessful mission.

IPPL commends our member and friend Bob Cooper for working so hard to keep gorillas out of Singapore Zoo's hands. Should Singapore Zoo wish to spend money on "saving" gorillas, it should support projects to protect gorilla habitat and free-living gorillas in Africa.

ZOO IGNORED IPPL WARNING

On 16 June 1983, IPPL sent a letter to Bernard Harrison, Director of Singapore Zoo, warning him about the activities of Belgian smugglers who were obtaining gorillas illegally from Africa. In fact, IPPL believes that the arrangements for shipment of captive-born gorillas to Singapore Zoo were made by the Belgian dealer Munro (information provided to IPPL by a former Munro employee).

IPPL also expressed concern about reports that had reached Headquarters indicating that gibbons had died at both Singapore and Kuala Lumpur Zoos of the effects an unspecified ground pathogen, possibly *Pseudomonas pseudomallei*.

It is thus likely that zoo officials were fully aware that the gorillas might die of a fatal bacterial infection, but chose to take a gamble.

Singapore Zoo officials failed to answer IPPL's enquiry.

NEWS IN BRIEF

SOVIET UNION WON'T PAY

The Soviet Union now owes back dues of over \$300,000 (U.S.) to the Secretariat of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species, its accumulated membership dues over many years. The Soviet Union refuses to pay these arrears.

Nonetheless, a Soviet delegation had the gall to appear at the 1985 Conference of the Parties to CITES, held in April at Buenos Aires, Argentina.

In September 1984, the Soviet airline, Aeroflot, which flies to the Cameroun, carried from the country a smuggled baby gorilla consigned to a Japanese zoo. The animal was transhipped in Moscow, and was confiscated by Japanese authorities on arrival at Tokyo Airport.

Members may write letters, requesting that the Soviet Union pay its dues to the CITES Secretariat and that the country start immediately to enforce CITES provisions by not allowing importation or transit of endangered species of wildlife protected by the Convention.

Letters should be addressed to:
Premier Mikhail Gorbachev
The Kremlin, Moscow
U.S.S.R.

MONKEYS OUTWIT THAI OFFICIALS

Over 1,000 Crab-eating macaques living around a hilltop palace in Phetburi, Thailand, have outwitted Thai government officials trying to catch them.

THE INTERNATIONAL PRIMATE PROTECTION LEAGUE

REPRESENTED IN BANGLADESH . BRAZIL . BURMA . CAMEROUN . CANADA . GHANA . HONG KONG
INDIA . JAPAN . LIBERIA . NETHERLANDS . PAKISTAN . PERU . SINGAPORE
S. AFRICA . SPAIN . TAIWAN . TANZANIA . THAILAND . U.K. . U.S.A. . ZIMBABWE

U.K. OFFICE
I.P.P.L.
19-21 ARGYLE STREET,
LONDON, W1V 3DU.

Please reply to: Shirley McGreal

IPPL
P.O. Drawer X
Summerville
SC 29483
16 June 1983

Mr. Bernard Harrison
Singapore Zoo
Singapore

Dear Mr. Harrison,

I was surprised to read in the enclosed cutting that the Singapore Zoo is planning to acquire gorillas.

We are concerned as to the likely origin of any female gorillas. Should your wish to obtain gorillas become known to the notorious Belgian wildlife smugglers, it is likely that they would move heaven and earth to get them rapidly since Belgium will be forced to apply the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species from 1 January 1984.

I am sure you can understand that the Belgian smugglers will be very anxious to make some last-minute profits before 1 January. Hence, this is a period of extreme danger for gorillas and other species frequently smuggled through Belgium. With the prospect of \$75,000 sales, they will not care how many wild gorilla groups are slaughtered to get their babies to supply buyers. At least one Belgian smuggler has been able to get many endangered species such as gorillas and Pygmy chimpanzees from Zaire. The Government of Belgium allows the export of these animals, some as wild animals and some as phony captive-born animals. Several disreputable zoos "launder" wild-born animals by providing documentation that they are "captive-born."

IPPL feels that the greatest favor zoos can do for gorillas is to support projects to protect them in the wild and to avoid any dealing with unscrupulous traders. It would probably be better if institutions not currently holding gorillas did not seek to acquire any as they are very fragile animals requiring specialised care and diet. Further, I understand Singapore Zoo has lost some apes to pathogenic ground bacteria. It would hardly serve the interests of conservation should animals be acquired and lost.

Your comments would be appreciated, as well as your assurance that you will not have any dealings with the disreputable Belgian wildlife smugglers in your efforts to acquire gorillas.

Truly yours
Shirley McGreal
Shirley McGreal
Chairwoman, IPPL

The monkeys had reportedly been bothering tourists by snatching food and purses, and ripping plastic seats off motor-bikes. They also broke TV antennas off local residents' homes.

Although Thai animal-lovers have protested the trapping program, the government plans to remove all the monkeys and release them in another location.

MISTREATMENT OF MONKEYS IN MOROCCO

Mrs. Sara Whiteside of Hertfordshire, England, visited Morocco in April 1985. She visited the legendary city of Marrakech and went to its famous square where acrobats and jugglers perform and story-tellers and musicians from the desert entertain the public.

However, Mrs. Whiteside was appalled by one of the attractions. She writes:

I saw terrified, distressed monkeys chained to a box, being forced to somersault in front of an audience. The "trainer" achieved this effect by banging a lead pipe behind the monkey, terrifying it into turning over. Many other tiny monkeys were chained nearby with less than a foot to run around in. This disgusting spectacle occurs daily in the square in Marrakech. Can anything be done to help these monkeys?

Should any IPPL member be planning a visit to Morocco, please contact Headquarters, as we'd like you to check this situation out.

PRO-PRIMATE ACTIVITIES

The International Primate Protection League, as the longest-established organization devoted to primate protection, is delighted to see an upswing in grass-roots local activism on behalf of beleaguered primates. Pro-primate demonstrations in the United States and Canada were unheard-of until a group of South Carolina animal activists (led by IPPL Chairwoman Shirley McGreal), picketed the Medical University of South Carolina in Charleston on 14 October 1978, to protest experiments in which healthy monkeys were turned into paralysed "vegetables" by having weights dropped on their spines.

Prior to IPPL's existence, and growing public awareness of what wonderful animals primates are, people would sometimes say to IPPL officers, "If we didn't use primates, we'd use more cats and dogs," or "I don't like monkeys, they're nasty, dirty animals!" Things have changed since and the international movement for primate protection is growing. We intend to report grass-roots activities on behalf of primates in future *Newsletters* (be it "armchair activities" such as letter-writing, or public protests). So, let us know what you are doing.

Here are brief accounts of some recent pro-primate activities.

WRIGHT-PATTERSON AIR FORCE BASE, DAYTON, OHIO

IPPL member Linda Leas (who works with the Mobilization for Animals), organised a demonstration at the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base on 27 April 1985. In 1984, the Base used 129 primates in experiments. Of these 129 primates, the Base Veterinarian admitted that 26 had been used **unanesthetised** in painful or stressful experiments.

PALO ALTO, CALIFORNIA

On 28 April 1985, activist groups belonging to the Syntex-Stanford Coalition (these include IPPL), picketed Syntex, a commercial laboratory which uses primates and dogs in its experiments. In 1983, Syntex used 115 unanesthetised primates in painful experiments.

This protest was followed by a funeral procession to Stanford University, in memory of the animals that have died in experiments there. Among primate studies performed at Stanford University are mother-infant deprivation experiments, using squirrel monkeys. Rally speakers included three IPPL members, Dr. Jeri Ryan of Psychologists for the Ethical Treatment of Animals, Dr. Nedim Buyukmihci of Veterinarians for Animal Rights, and Joyce Tischer of the Animal Legal Defense Fund.



Davis Protestor Dragged Away

NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA

Animal Peace, a New Orleans group, is working to make life more bearable for the primates incarcerated at the Delta Primate Center. The group has provided swings for the chimpanzees, and sends monthly gifts of raisins and peanuts to supplement the primates' laboratory diets.

NEW YORK, NEW YORK

In an unusual "consciousness-raising" activity, IPPL member Sybil Landau, an attorney, took action after seeing a picture of a monkey in a restraint chair (with gadgets sticking out from various parts of his body) in *The Brief*, a publication of the American Bar Association. Ms. Landau asked the Editor of *The Brief* how he could justify publishing a photograph of a distressed monkey. James Carr, Editor, replied that he did not think the monkey was exhibiting distress, and stated that, "Neither I nor anyone associated with *The Brief* would condone the casual or unexplained use of a photograph of any animal experiencing unnecessary or inappropriate suffering."

CLEVELAND, OHIO

Fran Goldlust and Dave Sickles, of the Ohio chapter of PETA, are trying to improve the conditions in which a Capuchin monkey lives at a local pet store. The monkey is kept in a cage behind the counter and a sign warns that he bites. The salesman told Ms. Goldlust that, "As far as I am concerned, the only good monkey is a dead monkey." Ms. Goldlust and Mr. Sickles want to get the monkey removed to a good home.

DAVIS, CALIFORNIA

Twelve demonstrators (ages ranging from 16-58) were arrested by the University of California Police at Davis, California on 23 April 1985, for blockading the entrance to the Davis Primate Center in an attempt to prevent "business as usual." Nine demonstrators were arrested at a simultaneous demonstration at the University of California's Tolman Hall research laboratory at Berkeley.

The protestors were charged with trespass.

The civil disobedience at Davis was followed by a mock funeral procession held on 24 April. The 50-vehicle motorcade travelled from Sacramento to the Davis Primate Center, where over 100 primates were killed in experiments in 1984. A remembrance ceremony was held in honor of the dead primates.

BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

Buddhists Concerned for Animals, a San Francisco-based organization with 2,000 members, has sued the Department of Agriculture for a second time in connection with conditions under which animals, including primates, are maintained at the University of California at Berkeley. The first suit resulted in a conviction for the university. The new suit alleges that the Department of Agriculture continues to fail to enforce the Animal Welfare Act on the university.

VANCOUVER, CANADA

Peter Hamilton, of the Lifeforce Foundation, Vancouver, Canada, is involved in two major campaigns.

Hamilton has devised a novel protest against the keeping of primates in restraint chairs. He devised his own "restraint chair" and sat in it outside 3 Vancouver research facilities. The media covered the protest and the University of British Columbia has now decided not to allow long-term maintenance of primates in restraint chairs.

The Foundation has filed cruelty charges against two Canadian experimenters, B.M. Wolfe and B. Rapley of the University of Western Ontario. The researchers were charged under Section 402 (1) (A) of the Criminal Code of Canada, which states that, "Everyone commits an offense who willfully causes, or being the owner, willfully permits to be caused, unnecessary pain, suffering, or injury to an animal or bird."

The charges relate to alleged mistreatment of Debbie, a baboon, and other primates kept in long-term restraint at the university as part of diet-cholesterol studies.

IPPL OFFICIALS**CHAIRWOMAN: Dr. Shirley McGreal****TREASURER: Diane Walters****SECRETARY: Marjorie Doggett****FIELD REPRESENTATIVES**

Vijay Bhatia (North India)
 Siddhadha Buch (South India)
 Dr. Roland Corluy (Belgium)
 Marjorie Doggett (Singapore)
 Anne Doncaster (Canada)
 Dr. Gustavo Gandini (Italy)
 Gombe Stream Research Center (Tanzania)
 Sumit Hemasol (Thailand)
 Viroj Pruesanusak (Thailand)
 Dr. Zakir Husain (Bangla Desh)
 Dr. Qazi Javed (Pakistan)
 Linda Laikre (Sweden)

Alika Lindbergh (France)
 Dr. S. M. Mohnot (Central and West India)
 Okko Reussien (Netherlands)
 Cyril Rosen (United Kingdom)
 Charles Shuttleworth (Taiwan)
 Jean Senogles (South Africa)
 Dr. Akira Suzuki (Japan)
 Señor Santiago Lopez de Ipina Mattern (Spain)
 Valerie Sackey (Ghana)
 B. and P. Templer (Spain)
 F. Thomas (Hong Kong)
 Mr. Vivian Wilson (Zimbabwe)

ADVISORY BOARD

Dr. James Alcock
 Stella Brewer
 Dr. Frances Burton
 Bruce Feldmann D.V.M.
 William M. George M.D.
 K. Kalyan Gogoi

Dr. Jane Goodall
 Dr. Colin Groves
 Dr. Barbara Harrison
 Ann Koros
 Lim Boo Liat
 Dr. Georgette Maroldo

Dr. William McGrew
 Anna Merz
 Dr. Vernon Reynolds
 Dr. Geza Teleki
 Dr. Arthur Westing
 Dr. Linda Wolfe

LOCAL CONTACT: Dr. Dao-van Tien, Democratic Republic of Vietnam**STAFF ARTIST: Kamol Komolphalin****HOW TO JOIN:**

Complete the form below and mail it with a check payable to the International Primate Protection League, to either IPPL, P.O. Box 766, Summerville, S.C. 29484 U.S.A. or IPPL, Regent Arcade House, 19-25 Argyll St., London, W1V2DU, England. Membership fees and contributions are tax deductible in the U.S.A.

Overseas payments should be made in US dollars whenever possible. If payment is made in foreign currency, US \$1.00 should be added to cover the bank's service charge on international transactions. Overseas members wishing to receive their newsletters by Air Mail should add US \$3.50.

I wish to join IPPL as a: () Patron — \$100.00 or £ 50
 () Sustaining Member — \$25.00 or £ 15
 () Regular — \$10.00 or £ 5
 () Student Member — \$7.00 or £ 3

Name _____
 City _____ State _____ Code _____ Country _____

All members receive complimentary copies of the IPPL Newsletter. Individuals or organizations may subscribe to the IPPL Newsletter at an annual fee of \$10.00.

Please suggest names of people who you think would like to receive information about IPPL.

Name _____ Street _____

City _____ State _____ Zip Code _____ Country _____

Name _____ Street _____

City _____ State _____ Zip Code _____ Country _____

Name _____ Street _____

City _____ State _____ Zip Code _____ Country _____

International Primate Protection League
P.O. Box 766
Summerville, S.C. 29484
U.S.A.

Nonprofit Org.
 U.S. Postage
 PAID
 Summerville, SC
 Permit No. 087

ADDRESS CORRECTION REQUESTED**PRINTED MATTER**