





Opening Speeches

Opening address

Renate Kuenast

(at the time of the 5th WC German Federal Minister of Consumer Protection, Food and Agriculture)

Ms. Goodall,
Mr. Spielmann,
Ladies and gentlemen,

Welcome to the 5th World Congress on Alternatives and Animal Use in the Life Sciences! I am proud to have the opportunity to follow in the footsteps of Baltimore, Utrecht, Bologna and New Orleans and carry on this new and important tradition in animal welfare here, today, in Berlin!

Animal welfare is very important to us in Germany – in all areas:

- for livestock on farms and animals in the wild,
- for animals during transport and slaughter,
- for pets as well as laboratory animals.

We have established a sound legal foundation for this by incorporating animal welfare as a state aim into our constitution. We succeeded in amending the German constitution to include animal welfare as a state aim only because broad segments of German society are interested in animal welfare issues.

And because there is a steadily growing sense of responsibility for animals as fellow creatures among our citizens. This sense of responsibility has grown over the years. Consumer interest in animal welfare wasn't always as strong as it is today – not all animal welfare issues have been the focus of public discussion to the same degree. In fact, one issue has been anchored in the public's awareness for decades: Namely, the issue of animal testing! The credit for this goes first and foremost to the work of numerous organisations.

For more than 30 years now, animal welfare organisations have focused their criticism on animal testing. And scientists, industry and special interest organisations have been getting together every three years now for the last 12 years to discuss recent advances and new developments.

Ladies and gentlemen:

The 5th World Congress for Alternatives and Animal Use in the Life Sciences has developed into an international forum on animal welfare!

We all share the same goal: To reduce the suffering of animals as much as possible! The best and most desirable solution – following Russel and Burch's three "R" concept – is the replacement method: in other words, the best and most desirable solution would be to replace animal testing completely. But we also know that there are areas where we cannot completely dispense with animal testing. However – in keeping with the spirit of reduction – we want to at least substantially reduce the number of animals being used. Furthermore, we want to reduce the suffering of laboratory animals and the harm done to them as much as possible.

Ladies and gentlemen:

Animal welfare is an important intrinsic value. The challenge and obligation that we face here is to always look very closely when we weigh conflicting interests. We must ask ourselves: Where is animal testing truly indispensable for making our lives safer? Look at the pharmaceutical industry for example. And on the other hand: How can we do the most to replace animal testing? The underlying issue here is the value of life. This is an ethical question to which there are definitely no simple answers. One thing however must be understood: We cannot allow these two values – consumer protection and animal welfare – to be played off against one another! Instead, our goal must be to rec-



oncile them. I know that this is precisely the standard that you all set for yourselves and your work – and I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for this!

Ladies and gentlemen:

Animal welfare needs you. Although much progress has been made in recent years to help animals, we have to admit that animal welfare is still far from being a matter of course! This became clear, for instance, during the discussion over the draft constitution for the European Union: Establishing animal welfare as a cross-sectoral task has been a major victory for animal welfare. It is also a prerequisite for putting animal welfare right at the heart of the European Union. Looking at the long term however, our objective must be to establish animal welfare as a separate EU goal.

A Europe-wide survey conducted in June showed that the time is ripe for this. A majority of the persons surveyed in 15 of the EU's 25 member states said that they would like to see effective animal welfare in their country. A total of 46 percent of European consumers said that they would spend between five and ten percent more for products that have been produced in a way that satisfies animal welfare requirements. Eleven percent said they would be willing to spend even more.

We must of course be a little careful when interpreting these figures because what people say is not always the same as what they do. Actually, what is more interesting here is the fact that young people in particular feel that animal welfare is important. It always takes longer for behaviour to change than for awareness to develop.

Consequently, I am convinced that purchasing decisions will start catching up in the near future. The first generation of the 21st century will base its purchasing decisions on a different notion of quality. A notion that is based not only on product quality but also on process quality. In other words: the specific question of how and where products were produced, whether fair wages were paid, whether environmental criteria played a role in their production and – of course – whether due regard was paid to animal welfare. In my opinion, these will all be business advantages in the future.

And, as I would like to emphasise here: These sustainability-related concerns will become increasingly important for trade as consumer awareness of the importance of animal welfare grows. This is why it doesn't make sense to me that the World Trade Organization still classifies these criteria as "non-trade" concerns. The WTO will have to change its stance on this. The German government will continue its efforts to get animal welfare finally recognised.

In light of recent events, I would like to emphasise how important animal welfare is just one more time. We live in a world that is marked by ever-growing globalisation. As a result, animal health has taken on an entirely new meaning for everyone involved. The outbreak of avian flu in Asia has made it all too clear that epidemics among animals do have a major impact on trade. We live in an age of growing global flows of goods. This makes international solutions a necessity. I consider it a big step forward that the OIE has recognised animal welfare as an essential factor in fighting such epidemics. Now we need to take

that second step – namely, we need to establish animal welfare as a trade concern at the WTO.

Ladies and gentlemen:

The fact that trade and animal welfare belong together is also evidenced by trade and industry's involvement in this conference. The cosmetic industry is setting a good example here. In fact, in Germany, animal welfare was incorporated into the cosmetics industry years ago. As a rule, Germany does not allow animal tests to be used in the development of tobacco products or cosmetics. The EU Cosmetics Regulation has further improved the protection of animals in the testing of such products.

The Directive was transposed into national law in Germany in 2004. The new legislation prohibits the sale of cosmetic products that were tested on animals to ensure compliance with the provisions of this Directive – despite the existence of alternative methods that have been recognised by the European Union and the OECD. Starting on January 1st 2009, Community law will prohibit the sale of cosmetic products containing ingredients that were tested on animals after this date in order to meet the safety requirements of cosmetics regulations. This will apply even when there are no alternative testing methods. An exception has been made in four specific cases and the deadline for these was pushed back to March 2013. Given this situation, it is gratifying that the cosmetics industry is using the 5th World Congress here in Berlin as a forum: presenting to the scientific community recent advances in the development of new methods for testing the toxicological safety of cosmetic products.

colipa – the European Cosmetic, Toiletry and Perfumery Association – is intensively involved in the 5th World Congress. In addition, leading manufacturers of cosmetic products and their ingredients are important sponsors for this conference. A number of firms will also be presenting research projects that they have conducted to develop non-animal testing methods. It comes as no surprise that more than 10 percent of the abstracts submitted for lectures deal with in vitro methods for testing skin tolerance.

Ladies and gentlemen:

We also have to talk about the fact that although Germany has banned the use of animal tests in the development of cosmetics and tobacco products, such tests are required by law in other areas. Chemicals legislation is the source of one highly topical issue. The European Commission submitted its proposal for a regulation for the introduction of an EU-wide System for the Registration, Evaluation and Authorisation of Chemicals (also known as the REACH system) in 2003. This proposal contains the following key points:

- Manufacturers must register any substance that they produce in quantities of one or more tons a year. This requirement would apply to some 30,000 substances.
- A single system will apply to existing and new substances and the data requirements for both will be based on the existing procedure for new substances.
- Industry will be assigned greater responsibility, with government agencies concentrating on substances that are of very high concern and/or are produced in large quantities.



- It will be possible to require an authorisation procedure for some substances of very high concern.
- Downstream users will be incorporated into the system in cases where they do not wish to disclose their use of a particular substance to the manufacturer. The pending Community provisions will require existing substances to be comprehensively tested as well. This will improve our data and strengthen health, consumer and environmental protection interests considerably. And this is precisely what makes weighing these interests such a difficult balancing act.

I personally feel that an increase in the number of laboratory animals that is limited to the registration period for existing substances is justified when absolutely all scientifically satisfactory means for avoiding unnecessary animal tests have been exhausted. Looking at the Commission's proposal, there is still need for improvement in this area. Possible improvements include:

- Adding other already validated alternative methods to the Regulation's annex,
- Supporting the development and validation of alternative methods and
- Avoiding unnecessary duplication of testing activities, particularly by including a provision on using test documentation, following the provisions of the German Chemicals Act. This will require everyone to pull together:
 - The scientific community will have to work together on the development of alternative methods and their validation.
 - However, the political sector will also have to support the rapid development of alternatives to animal tests.

Ladies and gentlemen:

I would like to briefly outline the situation in Germany for you: The German government has set up two funding programs:

- The first is the Methods to Replace Animal Testing funding priority at the Federal Ministry of Education and Research that has been in place since 1984.

- The second is the Allocation of Research Funding for the Scientific Development of Alternatives to Animal Experiments programme which ZEBET – the Centre for Documentation and Evaluation of Alternatives to Animal Experiments at the Institute for Risk Assessment – has managed since 1990.

I would like to take this opportunity to expressly thank Professor Spielmann, the head of ZEBET, for his dedicated work. Both programmes are aimed at developing alternative methods to the toxicological safety testing on animals that the law requires. ZEBET frequently funds the groundwork done at individual laboratories to develop new methods. When this work shows promise, the Federal Ministry of Education and Research then funds pre-validation studies or validation studies in cooperation with industrial partners. Through these funding programmes, the Federal Republic of Germany wants to make what will be the largest contribution by far among all EU member states toward the development of non-animal testing methods.

And last of all, we have a third instrument to mirror the high scientific standards placed on the development of alternatives to animal testing. The Animal Welfare Research Prize, which is awarded every year together with prize money of 15,000 euros, seeks to encourage outstanding research work that revolves around methodological studies aimed at limiting and replacing animal testing. I am pleased to have the opportunity to single out this outstanding congress with this award later on.

I wish you all a very productive conference and a pleasant stay here in my hometown of Berlin!

Correspondence to

Renate Künast
Member of Parliament
Platz der Republik
11011 Berlin
Germany
www.renate-kuenast.de
renate.kuenast@bundestag.de



Ending Research on Non-Human Primates

Jane Goodall

Introduced by Andrew N. Rowan

Well, first of all, good morning everybody. I understand there are people here from 46 countries, is that right? That means there are 46 languages, or at least nearly 46 languages, represented. But, I want to bring a voice into this room, a different language, I want to introduce a voice of one of those animals whose future we are discussing. And there are people here in this audience who can reply, so that we can swell the sound of the chimpanzees' good morning greeting throughout the room, so let's try! Calls like a chimpanzee – Applause.

Before I talk about my vision for the future of chimpanzees and other non-human primates – and indeed all primates including ourselves, because we are part of the primate family and our future is hanging very much in the balance at the moment as a consequence of our destruction of the environment – I'd like to go back a bit, because Andrew (Rowan) just commented on his feeling of joy that we have come so far, that today we have a minister standing up and speaking eloquently and passionately about animal welfare. So, I'd like to take you back to how things were when I began to study chimpanzees in the very early sixties. When I first went to study the chimpanzees in Gombe National Park in Tanzania, I had no degree of any kind. I was selected by the late Louis Leakey, because he thought he saw in me someone who really cared about animals, who wanted to learn about them, who didn't care about clothes and hairdressing and things like that. So he offered me this opportunity and eventually got the money, and I began. And then, after I'd been in the field about a year, I got this letter from him saying, Jane, I shan't always be here to get money for you. You have to stand on your own two feet. You have to have a degree. We don't have time to mess with a B.A. You'll have to go straight for a Ph.D. I've got you a place in Cambridge University. He said I was going to be studying ethology at Cambridge. I didn't even know what the word meant. There were no faxes and e-mails in those days, so I had to wait to find out. When I got to Cambridge I was excited. I'd just begun to learn about the complexity of chimpanzee society. I'd just begun to come to know some of the individuals and their unique personalities. I was excited to learn about this scientific method. So you can imagine my dismay when I got to Cambridge and was told I had done everything wrong. First of all, I should not have named the chimpanzees. That was very unscientific; they should have had numbers. I couldn't talk about their mind or any possibility of rational thought, because that was unique to us. This was still taught to my son when he was at school, 20 or 30 years ago. And, thirdly, I absolutely could not talk about emotions in any other than human, because they were unique to us, and even if animals other than us did have emotions, we could never prove it. Therefore, we certainly shouldn't talk about it. And so, I was guilty of the terrible sin of anthropo-

morphism. I also talked about the vivid personalities of the chimpanzees I'd come to know. And that was wrong too. So here I was, young, naïve, no university training, I should have been slightly overwhelmed and subdued and very anxious to do things right.

But, you know, all through my childhood I'd had the most wonderful teacher. A teacher who taught me so much about animals and their behaviour: that they do have personalities and minds and feelings. And that was my dog Rusty. I knew from Rusty that these professors, erudite though they might be, were wrong in this particular instance. And I was very fortunate in having a superb mentor at Cambridge, my thesis supervisor, Robert Hind, who helped me negotiate the tricky scientific pathway of expressing what I believed to be true in such a way that I would not be torn to shreds by the far more scientifically qualified people I was working with. For example, I said to him one day that the old female, Flo, had a baby and that Fifi, the elder sister, was fascinated by this baby. Every time another young chimp came anywhere near, Fifi would chase that youngster away, with all her hair bristling. I said, she was jealous, and Robert said, you can't say that, because you can't prove it. So I said, well she was, so what shall I say? He said, you should say that Fifi behaved in such a way that, had she been a human child, we would say, she was jealous. Now this is brilliant and I took that advice with me throughout my whole career!

To come back to Andrews theme of feeling overjoyed at how far we've come, there are very few major universities in the world today where young people can't actually study the animal mind, animal mentation. We can even study animal emotions and try to sort them out – as well as our own emotions, by the way –, and we can even study animal personality. So, we have come quite a long way, but we haven't yet come far enough.

But, just for a few moments, let me talk about some of the things that have been so fascinating in the 45 years that we've been learning about these amazing chimpanzees at Gombe. Because, in a way, the chimpanzees are so like us that they serve as ambassadors for the rest of the non-human animal species. They show us very clearly that there is no sharp line between us and the rest of the animal kingdom. Back in the early sixties, there were many scientists, many ethologists, who truly believed that there was a line and that there was a disconnect in the process of evolution. There were all the animals, then a line, and then us with our unique qualities of mind and reason, emotions, personality and so forth.

Well, over these years we have learned a great deal about chimpanzees, not only at Gombe, but in other parts of Africa; not only in the wild, but also in some captive situations. And we're beginning to put together a rather awesome picture of this



closest of our known living relatives. About their complex social structure, long term family bonds which can persist through a life of anything up to 70 years, although we'd don't think they live much beyond 50 to 60 in the wild. There is a long childhood, a dependency on the mother during which time the brain is plastic and serves the same useful purposes it does in our own species for learning. We find that as we come up in the animal kingdom to more and more complex brains, so learning plays and ever more important role in acquiring individual behaviour. We find that the chimpanzees show sophisticated cooperation. When we come to non-verbal communication, kissing, embracing, holding hands and – by the way, when I first mentioned kissing and embracing in those early sixties, that was absolutely impermissible! I could not talk about other than humans kissing or embracing, but I did anyway. They kiss, they embrace, they hold hands, they pat one another on the back, and they beg, they shake their fists, they throw rocks. They do these things that we do in the same kind of context, and they clearly mean the same kind of thing. They show tool using behaviour, even tool making behaviour, and I don't know if any of you remember, but at the time in the early sixties, when I first saw a chimpanzee using a tool, I mean, picking a twig and stripping the leaves and making a tool, this had a huge impact on the scientific community, because it was thought that humans, and only humans, used and made tools. That was meant to differentiate us more than anything else from the rest of the animal kingdom. And we have now found out from these other chimp studies across Africa that everywhere where people have watched them in the long term, they have seen different examples of tools and different objects used for different purposes in different ways. And so, because it is very clear that these skills are passed from one generation to the next through observation, learning and imitation, and that chimpanzee youngsters can learn through direct imitation, just like our children, this is a definition of culture. So that we can say that chimpanzees have their primitive culture.

Unfortunately, there is a dark side to their nature. They are capable of extreme brutality, particularly when it comes to interactions between one community and a neighbouring social group. And, sadly, this makes them seem even more human-like than I thought they were before. I was criticised quite heavily when I first published the events I described as a "four year war" to be like some kind of primitive warfare, where the males of one community systematically annihilated the individuals of the neighbouring smaller group. People said that, well, if we think there is a common ancestor then everyone is going to say that aggressive tendencies have been inherited by humans through this ancient primate inheritance, and war and violence are inevitable in our species. Well, I do think we have inherited aggressive tendencies and I dare say that most of the people in this room would agree with me.

But, we have to remember that we've also inherited tendencies of compassion, love and altruism, and these are very clearly demonstrated in the chimpanzees too. And with our incredibly sophisticated intellect, the one thing I feel makes us more unique than any other single thing from the other animals is that we have this extraordinary spoken language, this sophisticated spoken language. This language that we are using today, a language

with which we can paint pictures with words and vividly describe things to people who have never been to the place or seen the things we are talking about. We can teach our children about things they don't know. So here we are with our sophisticated intellect, our ability to communicate in ever more sophisticated ways, electronically now, and we are standing at a crossroads as regards our stewardship of this planet, whether it be the environment or whether it be our fellow animals. We really are at a crossroads. And what we are here to talk about today, the three Rs, the eventual elimination of all animal experimentation and testing, is part of what seems to be happening now, which is an increased consciousness of our position in relation to this planet and an increased determination among some of us to hasten this process.

So anyway, back to the chimpanzees. There they are, as I say, ambassadors for the other species and certainly for the other non-human primates. I have had the privilege of working closely with baboons. I spent some time with Rhesus monkeys and I've watched all kinds of different monkeys jumping about in the trees in Africa, and to some extent have learned about their social behaviour. They are very special because they are so like us. How did I leave the forests that I love and start this process towards learning more and more about the use of chimpanzees and other primates in medical research? It actually happened unexpectedly. In 1986 there was a conference in America called "Understanding Chimpanzees" and we brought together all the different people studying chimpanzees in Africa and in some non-invasive captive situations. I went into that conference as a scientist, planning to continue collecting data and analysing it, which I loved. But, we had a session on conditions in captivity for chimpanzees. We had some secretly filmed footage from one of the labs where chimpanzees were imprisoned for medical research. We also had a session on conservation, which showed how the forests with chimpanzees across Africa were vanishing. And I came out of the conference an activist. Since that day in October 1986, I haven't been in any one place for more than three weeks.

I can never forget the shock that I had the first time I went into one of these biomedical labs. It was in Rockville, just outside Washington D.C. I was led first of all into a room where there were these things called isolets – I think they are mostly faded out now more or less everywhere. These were completely closed with air passing through vents. When the door of one of these isolets was opened, inside was revealed a four-year-old chimpanzee with dull eyes. She was rocking slightly from side to side. She was going to be moved to a larger isolet, because she was outgrowing this one. And so it went on. I went from cage to cage and, by the end of it, I was numb. Even though I'd seen a picture, it was not anything like seeing the reality. Afterwards, I was then taken to a room where there were lot of people from the National Institutes of Health, who were funding this research. We sat around the table and I found that everyone was looking at me. I didn't know what to say, because I was in a state of shock. But then what I did say was: "I am quite sure that everybody in this room, because everyone is a caring, compassionate person, is as shocked as I am." That was kind of clever, because they could not admit that they were not caring or com-



passionate, so they all nodded their heads. And that led to a conference which was funded by HSUS, the Humane Society of the United States of America, where for the first time, we brought together people working on chimpanzees in labs from different labs in the United States and those concerned for their welfare and people from the field. And you know what was strange? Here is another example of how far we've come. And these examples showing how far we have come are very encouraging because, if we have come this far, we can go further. The strange thing was that when I first began sitting down and talking to people who were working with chimps in the labs, there were a lot of animal rights groups who would not speak to me. They said I was talking to the enemy and that we should not do that. I was amazed, because if you don't talk to people, how will you ever move forward? So that conference led to two more.

The first time I saw a fully adult male chimpanzee in a lab I was led up to him by the veterinary. He said, Jojo is very gentle and he won't hurt you, before walking off to do something else. I was wearing a mask, I was made to wear the mask and a little cap and gloves. I knelt down in front of this cage and reached my hand through the bars and Jojo began grooming me through the glove. Suddenly I had this vision of other chimpanzees his age in Gombe, lying on the soft ground, climbing trees, making leafy nests, being groomed by their companions and here was this individual, by himself in a 5-foot by 5-foot steel barred cage where the only sound was the rattling of bars and the screaming of other frightened chimpanzees. I couldn't help it. There were tears running down beneath my mask. Then Jojo reached out one very gentle finger and he lifted my mask and sniffed his finger. It was just the most moving moment, and I think it's moments like that that give you the determination to do whatever you can do about this.

I've continued visiting labs and talking to people, because one of the things I feel very strongly about is that, it's really important that people become truly aware. That they want change not just because it's becoming legislation, not just because people demand different kinds of products and therefore the products have to be made to comply with what people wish, but because people are involved with their hearts. And so my method in dealing with this for me horrific situation has been to try and talk to more and more people.

So just one example of how that can work. I talked about my experience in that first lab I visited. Subsequently, the then very new director of that first lab, John Landon, told me, Jane, at that time I could willingly have murdered you. Even my own daughter heard you speak and was mad at me. But, he said, then I began to think about it and now I really want to thank you, because when I looked at what was going on, I realised it was absolutely inappropriate. And because I realised that, I was able to get money and I'd like to take you back to see the new lab, he said. Well, it's not perfect, far from it, but compared to what I first saw, it must have been like going into some kind of step towards heaven for the chimps.

So getting into peoples' hearts seems to me to be something that is really important. We started a programme called "Roots and Shoots", which is the Jane Goodall Institute's environmental and educational programme for young people. It started in

Tanzania 12 years ago and has now spread to 95 countries. It involves projects undertaken by children from pre-school right through university. Roots make a firm foundation. Shoots seem tiny, but many together can break through a brick wall. And if we see the brick wall as all the problems that we have inflicted on this planet, environmental ones, social ones, crime, cruelty, greed and so forth, then the combined hope of hundreds and thousands of young people can break through this brick wall and can make a better world.

I began putting my heart and soul into this program, because I while I was travelling around the world to raise awareness about the plight of chimps, about the plight of forests, about the cruelty, I kept meeting these young people who seemed to have lost hope. When I talked to them, they were either depressed or apathetic or in some cases bitter, angry, even violent, and they all said more or less the same thing. They said, we feel this way because we feel your generation has compromised our future and there is nothing we can do about it. The world is spinning downward and we feel helpless. So this programme is hands-on action, roll up your sleeves, get out there and do something. And, actually, the very thing that started it was having the chimpanzee as an ambassador, reaching out with one hand to the other animals and with the other hand to us, making the world whole. They work on a project to make things better for their own human community, one for animals, including domestic animals, and one for the environment.

Many of them are deeply concerned about the use of animals in medical experimentation and testing. I have thousands of letters from children. It's desperately important that children learn to understand why things have happened. It's particularly important for them to understand that the people working in these fields are not evil monsters. You'd be amazed how many children automatically assume that anybody who puts on a white coat and does anything with an animal in a lab is some kind of monster. We have to help young people understand what it's all about, where it's come from and where it's going.

Again I would like to come back to what you said, Andrew, because I think we really are at a time now where we can stop thinking about the three Rs and concentrate on one, which is REPLACE. It's not that we can replace everything immediately. You know far more than I do about that. But, work towards it we all can, and I think what should be encouraging here is the number of procedures which can be done without using animals today. Ten years ago people said that would be impossible. So, when I talk to the groups of Roots and Shoots and when I listen to what they've done, when I hear about their peaceful protests outside some of the labs, I say to them, you know, it's just that you need to think differently. Instead of thinking, well, it's really unfortunate that we'll always have to use some animals, but we'll use them as kindly as we can, we'll prevent them from experiencing as much pain as possible, we'll use as few as possible, we'll enrich their lives, we'll try to treat them nicely, but it's sad, we'll always need some. If we turn that around and say, well, think of what we know today about the true nature of animals. Chimpanzees were a bit of a shock to the people back in the early sixties: that they could actually reason, that they could learn sign language and that they could communicate with each



other. This was pretty shocking to a lot of people. But what are we learning today? There are certain things that birds appear to be very intelligent about, but it was always said they couldn't be that intelligent, because their brain did not have the right structure. Thanks to some crows, who are so clever at fashioning tools for specific purposes, people have now re-examined the bird brain and are thinking differently about some of these extraordinary parrots who can learn many, many words. The parrot who knows the most words now has a score of 1350. And no word is counted in his vocabulary unless it's been introduced by him three times in the right context into his sentences, because he speaks in sentences. So, people are now thinking differently about birds. I was just in the most amazing project in Tanzania where giant African rats have been trained to detect landmines. They can smell the explosives. Rats are now also being trained to detect the very early signs of TB from sputum in hospitals. Every rat in that project has a name, every rat's personality is known by the trainer. There is this terrific bond between rat and trainer. We are learning more and more about the tremendously beneficial healing actions of dogs or cats with sick people, we are learning more and more amazing things about rescue dogs, and we have found that autistic and other learning-disabled children have learned to read by talking to a dog or a cat, who is so non-critical, non-judgemental. So, we are learning more and more about animals' brains and abilities and sentience, and we are learning more and more about what they can do for us.

And so it's moving into the time when we need a new mind set. A new mind set that says, given what we know about animals today, it cannot be ethical to put them into tiny cages and do things to them, however nicely we treat them. While we have to, we'll do it and we will treat them as well as possible, but our mindset should be, let's get these extraordinary human brains around the world together and find ways of doing these things without using any animals as quickly as possible.

That's why I was so excited when Andrew said, would I come to speak to all of you, because that's what is happening here. This is the new mindset. That's why you are all here, or most of you. It's very exciting indeed. And with a critical mass of youth growing up to think differently, to understand animals and our role in being good stewards, we'll move further towards that time.

I want to end with two stories. The first is about a chimpanzee, who was captured when he was about two years old. His mother was shot and he was sent to be used for some kind of cancer research. He was named Old Man, because this very small chimpanzee had a wizened face from being sad, as any chimpanzee will be who's had his mother shot and who's been shipped away from Africa. Old Man was lucky, because when he was about 12 years old, they didn't need him anymore for in this work. He and three females were released onto a man-made island at a zoo in Florida and a young man called Mark was employed as a keeper. He was told, don't go anywhere near these chimps, they are much stronger than you are, they hate people, they'll try to kill you. So Mark used to take a little paddle steamer and go over and throw food onto the island. But, he began to watch these chimpanzees and he saw how joyous they were. Every time he appeared with food, before they took a single bite, they would

hug each other and kiss each other, make little sounds of happiness, kissing into each others necks. And he thought, how can I care for them if I don't have some kind of relationship with them? A baby was born, Old Man was the father. He loved this baby, he would share food with the child and carry him around and protect him from real and imagined danger. And one day Mark dared to hold out a banana and Old Man took it from his hand and he said to me, Jane, I know just how you felt when David Greybeard took a banana from you! And then the day came when he actually dared to step onto the shore of the island and nothing happened. One day he groomed Old Man and one day they played. They became friends. The females kept away, but they didn't harm him, until one day, when it had been raining, Mark slipped. He fell flat on his face, the baby screamed, the mother acted instantly, as mothers will, rushing in instinctively to protect the child, she bit Mark's neck as he lay on the ground. He felt the blood running down. Then one of the other females rushed up and bit his wrist and one of them bit his thigh. And he thought, how can I ever escape? He looked up and there was Old Man thundering across the island with his hair bristling and his lips bunched in a ferocious scowl, coming to rescue this baby and Mark thought he'd had it. He prepared to die. But what happened? Old Man pulled the three females off Mark and kept them away, screaming and roused as they were, while Mark dragged himself to the boat and to safety. I saw Mark when he came out of hospital, and he said, Jane, there's no question, Old Man saved my life. To me this is so symbolic, because if a chimpanzee, and one who has been abused and harmed by people, can behave thus to reach out across this presumed gap between our species to help a human friend in a time of need, then surely we with our greater capacity for understanding and compassion can do the same for the animals in their time of need?

The second story is about another chimpanzee who was born in Africa. His mother was shot and he was shipped off to a zoo in North America, where he ended up living for about ten years completely on his own. He was named Jojo. He was living in a small old-fashioned cage and then a new zoo director decided to create the biggest exhibit in North America. He built a large enclosure surrounded by a moat filled with water. Of course, chimps don't swim. And he put a number of chimps together into the enclosure including Jojo. Jojo was fine for a while. But then, one of the new young males challenged the senior male. The senior male happened to be Jojo. But Jojo didn't really understand chimp behaviour. He'd been alone and hadn't had the chance to learn. He was terrified by this bristling, swaggering creature displaying at him. And in his fear, he ran into the water. He didn't know about water either. He was so scared that he got over the barrier that was built to prevent the chimps drowning in the deep water beyond. Three times he came up, gasping for air. Then he disappeared under the water. There was just a small group of people on the other side of the moat. There was a keeper, who went off to get a stick to try and scoop Jojo out of the water, but luckily for Jojo, there was a man there who visits the zoo just one day a year with his wife and three little children. He jumped in. He jumped in even though the keeper grabbed him and told him he would be killed. He pulled away. He swam, feeling under the water, until he touched Jojo's body.



He got this 300 pound dead weight over his shoulder, but he felt little movements. Jojo wasn't dead. He got over the barrier and pushed Jojo up onto the bank of the enclosure and then turned to rejoin his rather hysterical family.

There was a woman there with a camera who didn't even remember filming. Most of the video is all over the place, but you can see and hear what happened next. The people on the far side of the moat start screaming at Rick to hurry back and that he's going to be killed. Coming down to see what the commotion is are three big males with bristling hair, and at the same time, Jojo is sliding back into the water, because the bank was too steep. The film amazingly steadies on Rick as he stands there. You see him looking up at his wife and kids, looking up towards where these chimps are coming from, and then you see him looking down at Jojo. For a moment he's completely still. And then he goes back. And again he pushes Jojo up onto the bank. And this time, in spite of everyone yelling at him, in spite of the three chimps approaching, he stays there, he's pushing as hard as he can, and Jojo is making really feeble attempts, trying to grab on to something, and just in time, he grabs hold of a thick tuft of grass and, with Rick pushing, manages to pull himself up to where the ground is level. And, just in time, Rick gets back over that barrier.

That evening that little piece of film was flashed across North America and the then director of the Jane Goodall Institute happened to see it. He called up Rick and said, that was a very brave thing you did. You must have known it was dangerous. Everyone was telling you. What made you do it? Rick said, well, you see, I happened to look into his eyes and it was like looking into the eyes of a man, and the message was, would anybody help me? And, you see, that's the message I've seen in the eyes of little chimps for sale in Africa, from under the frills of the circus, looking out from the 5-foot by 5-foot prisons in the medical research labs, and I've seen it too in the eyes of the monkeys in the labs, and the dogs, and the cats. I've seen it in the eyes of chained elephants, I've seen it in the eyes of children who've seen their parents killed in the ethnic violence in Africa. It's a look that when you see it and feel it in your heart, you have to jump in and try to help.

There's a big challenge ahead of us, for those who want to help, and that is that there is a new calling from the animal protection organisations worldwide to end the use of non-human primates in biomedical research and testing. We are moving in that direction. Some of the big chimp labs have indeed closed.

Lemcip closed. Gloria Brazier has 15 of the Lemcip chimps, she knows what they went through. She built a home for them. Some of the others have been housed in different zoos. The big BRPC lab in Holland is closing, they are not working on the chimps at the moment. They have to be housed. The Immunolab that was bought up by Baxter in Austria has closed. Those chimpanzees desperately need a home. The Caustin chimps and the Air Force chimps in New Mexico, fortunately, some white knight sprang to their rescue and with Carolin working to house them, they are moving to Florida to what for them must be paradise. As these labs close, as monkeys get fazed out as well, as they will, the animal welfare community has to be prepared to face a huge challenge. We have to find ways of housing them and caring for them when their days in medical research are ended. Chimp Haven is another sanctuary where chimps from medical research can go, but that's the tip of the iceberg, there are hundreds more chimpanzees needing to be housed and rescued, and thousands of non-human primates around the world.

But if we see that look and feel it in our hearts, we shall rise to that challenge and we shall move towards a time, step by step, sometimes quicker, when we need to use no other-than-human animals in medical research. Because, we do have hearts with compassion, we do have an understanding, we are learning more and more about what it means, the effects of what we are doing to these innocent creatures. So, I have absolutely no doubt at all that, seeing all your faces today, we are moving in that direction much faster than we ever have before. So, let's keep on that tidal wave and inspire more and more people to search for alternatives and not to be afraid of searching for alternatives where it seems that none can ever be. Because sometimes the impossible is possible if enough people get together and use this amazing, extraordinary human brain and decide, we're going to do it, simply because we must.

So, thank you for inviting me here, and for the opportunity, and to all of you for listening and for what all of you are doing, individually or as groups, to help animals. Thank you.

Correspondence to

Jane Goodall, Ph.D.
The Jane Goodall Institute
8700 Georgia Avenue
Silver Spring, MD
USA
www.janegoodall.org
e-mail: cfox@janegoodall.org



Welcoming speech

Reiner Wittkowski

Federal Institute for Risk Assessment, BfR, Berlin, Germany

Minister Künast,
President Tauber,
distinguished guests and colleagues,
and in particular Dr. Jane Goodall

Ladies and Gentlemen,

I am very happy to welcome you here in Berlin to the 5th World Congress on Alternatives and Animal Use in the Life Sciences on behalf of the Federal Institute for Risk Assessment, the BfR.

My colleague President Andreas Hensel has asked me to extend his warmest greetings to you as well.

Some of you may know that being here at this conference in Berlin is like coming back home and being back at the roots.

In November 1986 the Council Directive of the European Union concerning the protection of animals used for experimental and scientific purposes was adopted.

This directive called upon the Commission and the Member States of the European Community to develop and evaluate alternative methods to animal testing as well as to promote research in this field. It was in the context of the adaptation of German legislation on animal protection to this directive – pursuant to which authorisations for animal experiments may no longer be granted if suitable alternative or supplementary methods are available – that the National Centre for Documentation and Evaluation of Alternatives to Animal Experiments, with the abbreviation ZEBET, was founded in 1989 within the former Federal Health Office.

As far as I know, this was the first implementation of a group of researchers following a governmental initiative in the world.

As early as 1991, ZEBET was entrusted with the co-ordination of European validation projects as a result of the competence conceded to it within Europe. Close co-operation exists with the European Centre for the Validation of Alternative Methods (ECVAM), the EU agency which co-ordinates national activities within the European Community and which is meant to strive for recognition of the new methods outside of the European Community.

Absolutely indispensable for the world-wide acceptance of the alternative methods validated in Europe is the co-operation with America's Interagency Co-ordinating Committee for the Validation of Alternative Methods (ICCVAM) which was established almost 10 years ago and represents a total of 14 American federal authorities.

One patent indication of how well this co-operation works is the attendance of 120 US colleagues at today's event.

ZEBET today is integral part of the BfR.

The BfR is the national agency in Germany for regulating the safety of food and of all chemicals except drugs. Research at the BfR is focused on developing test methods for regulatory purposes. At the BfR several national and international reference laboratories are established in the areas of food and chemical safety. It is within the tradition of the BfR to always welcome new and advanced methods to improve consumer safety and also to improve the welfare of animals used in safety tests. Scientists from the BfR are representing Germany in international expert commissions, that are concerned with human safety, e.g. at the EU, OECD and WHO.

The global acceptance of the 3Rs principle “replace, reduce, refine” developed by Bill Russel and Rex Burch almost 50 years ago in the UK proves the humanity criterion, which they proposed in their book “The Principles of Humane Experimental Technique” is finally the benchmark for judging animal experiments from the ethical perspective:

“If we are to use a criterion for choosing experiments to perform, the criterion of humanity is the best we could possibly invent. The greatest scientific experiments have always been the most humane and the most aesthetically attractive, conveying that sense of beauty and elegance which is the essence of science at its most successful.”

Ladies and gentlemen, recently four alternative methods had been validated and accepted internationally by the European Union and the OECD.

This is a clear sign that the efforts we all undertake are worth to be undertaken. At present an animal test is under consideration, which I would like to mention exemplarily.

The EU Commission requires for the analysis of marine biotoxins in foods, mussels and shellfish safety testing by the mouse bioassay. The test consists of an injection of homogenates/extracts of mussels into mice to determine the LD₅₀. This test does not only lead to the death of the animals but is in addition extremely painful. Meanwhile, there are alternative methods available based on physico-chemical principles.

I personally welcome that the participants of this congress will discuss this particular problem and help to replace this



regulatory safety test, which is causing pain and suffering and in addition is less sensitive than the new advanced animal free test methods.

Ladies and gentlemen, Horst Spielmann is the head and the spirit of ZEBET from the beginning on and together with his co-workers Manfred Liebsch, Barbara Grune, Richard Vogel and many others they did a tremendous job over years resulting in this wonderful congress. Please allow me to blow my own trumpet now when I explain that I am very proud to have co-workers like them.

But, ladies and gentlemen, scientific expertise and engagement does not suffice to change the world per se. It always needs political backup and support, in particular financial support to attract young scientists to come up with new , methods and strategies. Our Minister Renate Künast is always standing in the first line and fighting when it comes to animal welfare and further improvements to follow the 3Rs principle. Consequently, she has overtaken the patronage

of this conference and I cannot imagine that there could be a better forum than this here and today to mention this and say thank you.

Finally, I want to thank all of you for coming to Berlin and participate in a congress that is focusing on an issue that has a high priority at the global level both from the scientific and ethical point of view. I want to thank all of you for devoting your time to the topics of the 5th World Congress and I am looking forward to the results of your discussions, which we will try to implement into our regulatory frame work.

Correspondence to

Prof. Dr. Reiner Wittkowski
Vice President of the
Federal Institute for Risk Assessment BfR
Thielallee 88-92
14195 Berlin
Germany