

MEETINGS and ANNOUNCEMENTS



MEETING REPORT

Nonhuman Primates in Biomedical Programs

The second annual symposium of the Institute for the Study of Animal Problems (Washington, DC), held 15 October 1980 in conjunction with The Humane Society of the United States' annual conference in San Francisco, California, brought together representatives from field primatology, laboratory animal research and the humane movement to discuss scientific and philosophical issues in the breeding, husbandry and experimental use of nonhuman primates.

Although the vast majority of animals used in research and testing are not primates, the subject of nonhuman primate experimentation figures prominently among the concerns of both researchers and animal welfare advocates. These concerns, however, often differ, or at least are expressed differently by each group. At the center of the issue lies an apparent ethical paradox: Nonhuman primates (monkeys and apes), due to their close evolutionary kinship to man, are considered to be eminently suitable

models for certain kinds of biomedical research, yet in the same light, their similarity to humans raises severe doubts about the moral acceptability of subjecting them to an existence which deprives them of freedom, health, and in many cases, life.

The symposium participants offered several strategies for handling this core problem and its surrounding layer of difficulties (e.g., depletion of species from the wild, inaccuracy of experimental results owing to the animals' sometimes pathogenic living conditions). Dr. Joe Held (National Institutes of Health, Washington, DC) presented a paper on the breeding and use of primates in the U.S. which stressed the essential nature of biomedical research and testing on monkeys and apes. While fully acknowledging the ethical as well as practical obstacles to continued importation of species from the wild, and promoting existing U.S. captive breeding programs as a solution, Dr. Held approached the paradox of primate use by placing human health interests in a position of paramount importance; as long as nonanimal alternatives are inadequate to replace current methods involving the use of primates, the emphasis, as expressed in the National Primate Plan of the NIH Interagency Primate Steering Committee (IPSC), must be on ensuring an uninterrupted supply of monkeys and apes for research. Within this context, the ethical responsibilities of biomedical science rest in providing humane care for the animals and in searching out and improving alternatives which, besides being in the animals' interests, are more economical.

Dr. Andrew Rowan (Institute for the Study of Animal Problems) countered Dr. Held's argument that primates are an essential tool for biomedical research in a paper which focused on examples of unnecessary and/or inappropriate use of primates in research programs. Dr. Rowan took

exception to the IPSC statement that a shortage of nonhuman primates threatens "essential" health activities, citing lifetime steroid contraceptive studies and polio vaccine production and testing as two major areas of questionable primate use; the former being unreliable when extrapolated to women and the latter being a case of excessive use of animals in light of currently existing alternatives. Dr. Rowan attributed much of the problem to mismanagement and improper regulation of safety testing and research. He proposed the formation of a "National Primate Study Authority" which would include representatives from humane and conservation groups and exercise stricter control over primate research in the U.S. than is possible within the present NIH structure. In Dr. Rowan's view, the paradox of primate use demands that primate research be pared down to the necessary minimum, funds and manpower be channeled into alternatives and treatment of great apes be upgraded to a point where it is no longer simply humane, but also aligned with the standards established for human experimentation.

Dr. Ardith Eudey (International Primate Protection League; University of Nevada) examined the roots of the paradox, stating that the "Darwinian revolution" which brought the world a nonteleological theory of evolution and contributed to the breakdown of anthropocentric thinking continues to be subverted by an older, dualistic view of man and nature. She illustrated this point with examples from common parlance: primates, like timber, are "renewable resources," monkeys and apes, our closest biological relatives, are sub- or nonhuman primates rather than her suggested term, "alloprimates." According to Dr. Eudey, Darwinian thought can be manipulated as well as ignored, *i.e.*, the emphasis in primate research on taxonomic close-

ness is a human decision. It may not always be appropriate from an evolutionary point of view and may even divert resources from more fruitful types of research. However, as long as research programs using primates continue, the primary goals must be conservation of rare, threatened and endangered species, increased public accountability of scientists, and revision and upgrading of the animals' housing and environment.

This last goal was examined in some detail by two speakers, Dr. Joachim Jaekel (CIBA-Geigy, Basel) and Dr. William McGrew (University of Stirling, Stirling, Scotland). Dr. McGrew maintained that the majority of captive primates live in pathogenic conditions which are either preventable or reversible, and therefore indefensible. Natural selection has shaped not only morphology and physiology, but also behavior. Thus, the captive environment should be as similar to the wild as possible to preserve the mental as well as physical health of the animals. This argument combines ethical, scientific and economic considerations: Ignorance of field studies can result in duplication of laboratory studies which in turn waste money and possibly create more suffering for the animals. Further, captive environments which do not provide for primates' social requirements and cognitive capabilities give rise to bored, stressed animals who are probably more difficult to work with and less likely to yield reliable experimental results.

Dr. Jaekel's presentation emerged as a practical testament to Dr. McGrew's recommendations. He showed a film of the rhesus monkey facility at CIBA-Geigy which appeared to prove that a recipe of simple housing modifications, empathy and common sense can produce healthy, well-adjusted animals who, though deprived of a pristine existence in the wild, manage to lead enriched, minimally stressful lives as ex-

perimental subjects. The CIBA-Geigy facility features a large exercise cage which the monkeys visit daily in groups. They have objects to manipulate and companions to groom, bicker at and play with. The animals forage for their food, which consists of 50% pellets and 50% fruits, seeds, and leaves. Equal to if not more important than physical enrichment is the relationship of the keeper and other personnel with the animals. Dr. Jaekel's experience has invalidated the economic argument against staff spending time with the animals; the time invested in establishing a comfortable, trusting relationship pays off in tractable animals and better data.

Dr. Jaekel offered several explanations for the mechanistic attitude which manifests itself in barren cages, isolation from conspecifics and other conditions which rob the animals of sensory and cognitive stimulation. He made specific mention of dualistic thinking, economic pressures and the magnitude of present day experimental animal use. However, as his presentation eloquently demonstrated, this attitude is neither universal nor immutable.

Two panel discussions followed the formal presentations. The first centered on the development of guidelines for enriched primate housing. There was general agreement among the panel members (Dr. Jaekel; Dr. Michael W. Fox, Institute for the Study of Animal Problems; Dr. Evalyn Segal, San Diego State University; and Dr. Joseph Spinelli, University of California at San Francisco) that behavioral needs of the animals should be taken into greater account in laboratory environmental design. Dr. McGrew recommended the addition of deep litter substrate (sawdust salted with cereal grains) as an immediate practical cage improvement, along with random variation of types and amounts of monkey chow. Dr. Spinelli added that journal editorial

boards could exert indirect influence on the quality of housing and environment by examining the conditioning procedures used by authors of submitted manuscripts as part of the publication decision process.

Up to the point of the second panel discussion on humane concerns in the use of nonhuman primates, there seemed to be genuine communication among the participants with varying points of view. However, when the central paradox was again raised in the form of the question of how to weigh the scientific value of primates against their interests and rights, a fundamental difference in perception of the problem appeared. Dr. William Mason (California Primate Research Station, University of California at Davis) attacked the belief that humans are in a position to judge what is good for other animals as anthropocentric, "naive realism." He denied any prescriptive content to scientific information and theory, stating that ethical choices are individual choices, that science as an institution has only one moral precept (truth), and that the scientist must not be burdened with legislation and regulations which might endanger that institution.

Dr. Mason's comments were challenged by several members of the audience on the grounds that legislation and regulations come into being because of human fallibility and that it is scientists and not an abstract Science which are operative in society and therefore accountable to it. The question of whether science can go beyond the empirical without becoming "anthropocentric" was largely ignored, perhaps because it was perceived as an intellectual *cul-de-sac*.

As at most scientific gatherings, exchanges became freer as the program neared an end. The atmosphere at the close of the meeting, appropriate to the paradoxical nature of

the subject, was both frustrating and encouraging. Frustrating because one can never be sure whether the new ideas, comments and suggestions generated by the symposium will survive and ultimately be transformed into action. Encouraging because without this first stage of thought and discussion, there can be little or no possibility for such a transformation.

N.A. HENESON

[The formal presentations of Drs. Held, Rowan, Eudey, Jaekel and McGrew will appear in serial issues of Volume II of the Journal beginning with this issue. — Ed.]

Royal Society of Medicine—Interactions Between Human and Animal Behavior

The section of Comparative Medicine held a most interesting meeting on 16 April 1980 chaired by the president Dr. P. Muggleton, on the subject of interactions between human and animal behavior. Dr. R. Muggford gave a paper which examined numerous aspects of the behavior of dogs in relation to their owners, from which it was possible to draw many conclusions about the nature of both human and canine species. Unfortunately Mr. A. Yoxall, who was to have spoken, was delayed by a road accident, and could not be present. The discussion was opened by Dr. D. Abrahamson, who broadened the scope of the meeting to explore wider aspects and comparisons between human and animal behavior and between veterinary and medical practice. This was followed by a full discussion in which many members of the audience participated.

It is clear from the numbers of pet animals which are kept, particularly in the more affluent societies, that such ownership must satisfy certain important human needs. Some time was devoted to considering why

people keep pets, in general, and more particularly dogs. Several surveys have been carried out for example in Australia, and in the UK, which have examined the reasons for pet ownership. In a high proportion of cases the reason is companionship. This, particularly in the case of dogs, includes to a large extent the generation of self esteem in the owner, due to the affection shown by the pet. Often the protective value of a dog is an additional factor which makes it a welcome member of a household. There are also social advantages in owning a pet. A person living alone might make few friends, but if he or she has a dog to take for walks, this often leads to conversations with other dog owners or passers-by who will admire the dog as an introductory gambit. A pet in the home can also be a social asset. A study was cited in which elderly single people were provided with a budgerigar. This led to them being more socially accepted, especially by children, who would be interested to visit the pet. Another advantage of such pet ownership is that it imposes a discipline and a daily routine on individuals who might otherwise decline to a monotonous and uneventful life through lack of external demands. The more obviously practical uses of dogs, such as shepherding or retrieving, only accounted for about 10% of the reasons given for ownership in one large survey. It is well known that people frequently enjoy talking to their pets, and this has also been studied by psychologists. Some of the conversations with pets can be likened to that addressed to very young children, and is purely a means of expressing affection. In many cases however, owners will confide their fears or depressions or share their pleasures and elation in conversation with their pets, and may find this very beneficial.

The value of pet animals to hu-

mans requires some explanation, in view of the undoubted disadvantages which pet ownership can also involve. Apart from cost and restriction of freedom, pet owners may face particular problems of difficult behavior in their animals. Dr. Mugford described many such cases, where dog owners had turned to him for advice when confronted with severe and persistent behavioral problems in their pet. It was often possible to suggest causes for the pet's unacceptable behavior, and to find ways of improving the relationship between it and its owner. An example was the dachshund which was a model of good behavior until his owner answered the telephone, at which time he would rush over and bite her leg. This could have been due to the telephone acting as an interruption to the attention the dog was getting from his mistress, and this was resented so forcefully that he discovered a way to quickly terminate the phone call. In many cases where a dog behaves badly, the owner may unknowingly reinforce the unwanted activity by calming and soothing the dog, whereas a sharp reprimand would be more appropriate.

Some behavioral problems may be associated with faults in diet, or possibly endocrinological imbalances. Traditional drug and surgical treatments are widely used by veterinary surgeons, but behavioral training is also a necessary, and perhaps more effective method. A poor relationship may develop between a dog and its owner for a great variety of causes. Failure of the owner to establish dominance can be a factor, but should not be overemphasized. It is certainly not always due to a failing on the part of the owner that a dog becomes unreliable and badly behaved. Observations were quoted which suggested that certain breeds of dog had more behavior problems than others, and the type of problem could also vary from breed to breed.

The point was made that dog breeders select for what is fashionable conformation, and little regard is paid to the features of the dog which make it an agreeable pet.

The incidence of cases of dogs becoming difficult to manage and a problem to their owners is hard to assess. Probably only a small proportion of owner/pet relationships run into problems, but equally it is probable that many are not brought to the attention of a professional adviser. The owner's threshold for accepting injury and embarrassment will be an important factor in determining this.

It was pointed out that, perhaps strangely, many people feel shy at admitting that they are fond of an animal. This applies particularly to professional men, who perhaps think the object of their affection should be a human and are reluctant to admit tender feelings for an animal. It is unfortunate that the curricula of veterinary colleges tend to imply a mechanistic view of animal life. This may be getting less so in recent years, but certainly used to be the case. (In human medical teaching also, there is often too little attention to the mental activities of the patient, this being overshadowed by the depth of knowledge of physical factors.) This dualism, which denies to animals any mental feelings of a human kind, and at the same time diminishes the importance of human feelings themselves, is to be regretted. Both practitioners of human and veterinary medicine would do well to give more thought to the mental activity of their patients. Animals can be of great value to people in many situations, and enhance their awareness and enjoyment of life. Where the human/animal relationship is upset, and the animal behaves badly, it can cause great unhappiness to the owner who may feel both guilt and sorrow at the prospect of having to lose a still-loved pet. These situations require

prompt and careful analysis, which in many cases can restore a good and happy relationship.

G.A. Cullen
Editorial Representative
Section of Comparative Medicine

Reprinted with permission from the *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine* 73: 755-756, 1980.

FORTHCOMING MEETINGS

The Foundation of Thanatology: Veterinary Medical Practice: Pet Loss and Human Emotion, March 27-29, 1981, Alumni Auditorium, Black Building, Columbia-Presbyterian Medical Center, New York, NY. Contact Dr. Austin H. Kutscher, Foundation of Thanatology, 630 West 168th St., New York, NY 10032, USA.

American Association of Swine Practitioners: Annual Meeting, May 17-19, 1981, Kansas City, MO. Contact Dr. F.D. Wertman, AASP Executive Secretary, 5921 Fleur Drive, Des Moines, IA 50321.

VII International Congress of the World Veterinary Poultry Association: July 1-3, 1981, Oslo, Norway. Contact the WVPA Organizing Committee, National Veterinary Institute, POB 8156 Dep, Oslo 1, Norway.

Hungarian Society of Agricultural Sciences: International Conference of Ethology, August 24-27, 1981, Agricultural University of Godollo, Godollo, Hungary. Topics include "The Role of Ethology in Large Scale Animal Breeding," and "Developing the Technical-Biological Unit of Industry! Animal Breeding with Help of Ethological Research." Contact Prof.

Dr. J. Czako, Organizing Committee for Congress of Applied Animal Ethology, Agricultural University, Godollo, H2103, Hungary.

Wildlife Disease Association (Australasian Section): Fourth International Wildlife Diseases Conference, August 24-28, 1981, Sydney, Australia. Contact Dr. E.P. Finnie, Program Chairman, Toranga Park Zoo, Mosman, NSW 2088, Australia, or Dr. M.E. Fowler, Dept. of Medicine, School of Veterinary Medicine, University of California at Davis, Davis, CA 95616, USA.

International Conference on the Human/Companion Animal Bond: October 5-7, 1981, Philadelphia, PA. Sponsored by the University of Pennsylvania Center for the Interaction of Animals and Society and the Delta Group of the Latham Foundation. Contact the Center (above), School of Veterinary Medicine, University of Pennsylvania, 3800 Spruce St., Philadelphia, PA 19104.

Correction

In the last issue of this Journal (*Int J Stud Anim Prob* 1(6): 362-365, 1980), James A. Cohen, the author of the Comment piece entitled "Ethology and Laboratory Animal Welfare" was identified as a graduate student in the Department of Zoology of the University of Florida. This information is correct; however, we failed to mention Mr. Cohen's affiliation with the World Federation for the Protection of Animals as their former Scientific Consultant. This was a serious oversight and we sincerely regret the error.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Forthcoming Articles

- History of the Humane Movement and Prospects for the 80s—Robert A. Brown
- The Role and Responsibility of Zoological Establishments: An Animal Protection Viewpoint—John E. Cooper
- Government Veterinarians and the Ethics of Regulation—Lester M. Crawford
- Ethical Concerns in Primate Use and Husbandry—Ardith Eudey
- Behavior of Calves in a Railcar Modified for Feeding and Watering in Transit—Ted H. Friend
- Euthanasia of Day-Old Male Chicks—Walter Jaksch
- Toward a New Wildlife Management—Brandon Kuker-Reines
- Biomedical Research and Animal Welfare: Traditional Viewpoints and Future Directions—Franklin M. Loew
- The Case for Revising Our Laws on Animal Experimentation—David L. Markell
- Animal Rights Politics: The Need for the Human Connection—Jim Mason
- Experiences on the Protection of Large Predators in Finland—Erkki Pulliainen
- The Metaphysics of Anthropocentrism—Bernard Rollin
- Nonhuman Primate Social Requirements and Cognitive Capabilities—William C. McGrew
- The Buller-Steer Syndrome—Richard H. Ulbrich

Message From the President of ISPA

Following years of negotiation and preparation, the International Society for the Protection of Animals (ISPA) Board of Directors met recently in Copenhagen and unanimously accepted details of the merger between ISPA and the World Federation

for the Protection of Animals (WFPA). The Council of WFPA had met previously and given its approval to the merger.

The new organization became fully operative on January 1st, 1981 and is called the World Society for the Protection of Animals (WSPA).

The new World Society will emerge stronger and more effective than either ISPA or WFPA operating in isolation. More important still, it will speak out against animal abuse with authority and with one voice.

The World Society's headquarters will be sited at 106 Jermyn Street, London, which will also serve as the Regional Office for Africa and Asia, with subsidiary offices in Africa and Asia planned for the future. The European Regional Office will be sited in Zurich, Switzerland, with Boston, USA, being the Regional Office for the Western Hemisphere. A subsidiary office is planned for Latin America.

For obvious reasons the "ISPA News" and WFPA's "Animalia" will cease to exist on emergence of the new World Society, and it is not without some pangs of sadness to those members of staff who have been involved with both publications for many years. However, we are more than confident that "Animals International" which will be the World Society's principal journal, will incorporate the best of both the other journals and will be informative, factual and interesting.

WSPA will pick up the torch for the protection of animals carried so well by ISPA and WFPA, and will as one unit pursue the theme of animal protection around the world. Animal transportation, legislation, conservation, whales, seals, laboratory animals and many more subjects will continue to be the framework of subjects on which WSPA will carry out its anti-cruelty and protection campaign. The existing members of ISPA and

WFPA have already indicated their enthusiasm and eagerness to support the new Society. Readers are invited to sign up in each of the above-mentioned offices to ensure that the animal protection work, so well started, can be carried forward with an ever increasing momentum until the world is a safe place where animals may live their lives without fear of cruelty on the part of man.

As an individual you are important because, for the World Society to be effective, it really does need your enthusiasm and help in order to be as persuasive in international matters as it is in local or national affairs.

Courses for New Licensees—United Kingdom

One-day courses for new or aspiring Home Office licensees are being organized by the Institute of Basic Medical Sciences at the Royal College of Surgeons of England. These courses cover law and codes of practice relating to animal work, handling and sexing of animals, techniques for injection and removal of body fluids, anesthesia, analgesia and euthanasia and an introduction to surgery. Practical sessions augment formal lectures and there is ample time for questions and discussion. Publications and equipment are on display and each registrant receives copies of relevant literature.

These courses are primarily aimed at those scientists who are embarking upon research using animals but are unable to spare the time to attend a more comprehensive program of tuition. In addition, however, they prove useful as a revision course for scientific and senior technical staff who are already engaged in such work.

The provisional dates for the 1981 courses are: 4th February, 20th May, and 9th September. Further information on these and other short

courses may be obtained by contacting the Course Organizer, Royal College of Surgeons of England, 35-43 Lincoln's Inn Fields, London WC2A 3PN. [Ed. Note: Persons who wish to do experiments on animals in the UK which are likely to cause pain must first obtain a license from the Home Office.]

Proceedings from Guelph Meeting on the Ethics of Animal Use

The proceedings of a meeting of scientists and philosophers held at the University of Guelph, June 12-13, 1979 on the ethical and practical aspects of animal rights and animal welfare have now appeared in *Animal Regulation Studies* 2(3), 1980. The authors and titles of their talks are listed below. Please note that one of the articles is by M.A. Fox and another by M.W. Fox. This is not a misprint; they are two different people with very different views.

- F.M. Loew (Baltimore, Md, USA)—Animals in biomedical research: North American practice (pp. 141-144).
- J.R. Hurnik (Guelph, Ontario, Canada)—Animal welfare and modern agriculture (pp. 145-164).
- P. Singer (Clayton, Victoria, Australia)—Animals and human beings as equals (pp. 165-174).
- M.W. Fox (Washington, DC, USA)—Intensive factory farming and the question of animal rights (pp. 175-190).
- M.A. Fox (Kingston, Ontario, Canada)—On justifying the use of animals for human ends (pp. 191-204).
- M. Martin (Boston, Massachusetts, USA)—Vegetarianism, the right to life and fellow creaturehood (pp. 205-214).
- R. Harrison (London, UK)—Animal production and welfare: Practical considerations (pp. 215-222).

- J. Narveson (Waterloo, Ontario, Canada)—Animal rights revisited (pp. 223-236).
- H.C. Rowsell and A.A. McWilliam (Ottawa, Ontario, Canada)—The animal in research: domination or stewardship (pp. 237-254).
- H. Lehman (Guelph, Ontario, Canada)—Concluding remarks: scientists, philosophers and ethical problems (pp. 255-257).